DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 129 125 HE 007 856

AUTHOR	Rosenblatt, Aaron; And Others
TITLE	The Adelphi Experiment: Accelerating Social Work Education.
INSTITUTION	Council on Social Work Education, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	76
NOTE	198p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Council on Social Work Education, 345 East 46th Street, New York, New York 10017 ($4.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Advanced Placement Programs; *Field Experience Programs; Graduate Students; Graduate Surveys; *Higher Education; *Masters Degrees; Professional Education; *Social Welfare; *Social Work; Social Workers; Student Adjustment; Student Evaluation; Summer Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Adelphi University

ABSTRACT

The educational program adopted at Adelphi University School of Social Work provides students interested in obtaining the master's degree in social work with an opportunity to accelerate their professional education. As undergraduate students they can elect to major in social welfare, and if they do, some courses usually available only to graduate students will be open to them. They can also earn credits for their field work experience. Once they receive their baccalaureate degree, a number of them are admitted to the accelerated graduate program, which initially consists of enrollment in a summer session at the school of social work. At the completion of this program the students enter the school as second-year students. The accelerated students were found to catch up to the traditional students after the summer experience. Reports are included in this evaluation of changes in students' knowledge, values and skill; their educational background and practice skill one year after graduation; coping with their feelings of inferiority; and social constraints affecting the interpretation of the findings in evaluative studies. (LBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED129125

THE ADELPHI EXPERIMENT:

ACCELERATING SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

Council on Social Work Education

BY AARON ROSENBLATT,
MARIANNE WELTER,
SOPHIE WOJCIECHOWSKI

HE 007 856

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COUNCIL ON
SOCIAL WORK
EDUCATION

THE ADELPHI EXPERIMENT:

Accelerating Social Work Education

by

Aaron Rosenblatt,
Marianne Welter,
Sophie Wojciechowski

PUBLISHED IN COOPERATION WITH
THE ADELPHI UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

COUNCIL ON SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

New York

COPYRIGHT© 1976 BY

THE COUNCIL ON SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION, INC.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOG CARD NO. 76-1789

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the contributors and do not necessarily reflect the policy or position of the Council on Social Work Education. No official endorsement of the views presented should be inferred unless it is so indicated.

COUNCIL ON SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION
345 EAST 46TH STREET, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10017

Foreword

The social work profession, like any dynamic profession, responds to human need from its own particular frame of reference. Perhaps social work, unlike many other professions, has not had the opportunity to study, plan, and develop curricula responses, whether these be at the direct service or at the social policy level. Part of this probably has to do not only with the profession's historical stance as action-oriented but also with its low status in society (research requires money). Part, certainly, has been its relative infancy (like all social sciences) insofar as research and development are not a comfortable part of the professional armamentorium.

The experiment that is reported on in this volume represents an exception to the conditions discussed above. With the assistance of the National Institute of Mental Health during those more prosperous days of the middle 1960s, we at Adelphi undertook an experiment that gathered objective data about a central issue in social work education, namely the practicality and feasibility of an acceleration between the graduate and undergraduate levels of education. Subsequent to the beginning of this project, the term "continuum" has been applied to such arrangements.

At Adelphi we define continuum as the *on-going linkage* between undergraduate and graduate education, assuming that these have a mutual impact upon each other. Although the program reported here involves education at both the bachelor's and the master's levels, subsequent experiences have convinced us that similar relationships also exist between the master's and doctoral levels. We hope that a similar experiment might be undertaken with respect to these two levels and eventually with respect to the thread of relationship that may exist among all levels of social work education. The continuum needs much more experimentation. It would be gratuitous to say that the report presented in this volume is only the beginning. We hope that one value of this work (aside from the intrinsic value of the findings) will be to encourage similar and more refined research.

The history of the growth of this project was simple and logical. The undergraduate program in social work was already 24 years old when it became a part of the responsibility of the School of Social Work at Adelphi University in 1962. Until then, although lodged in the Sociology Department under the jurisdiction of a social worker, it had been remote from the graduate program. In 1959 the two programs had begun to move closer together when the dean of the Graduate School of Social Work began to offer consultation in response to a request from the sociology faculty.

When the undergraduate program was incorporated as a part of the school program in 1962, the name of the school was changed from the Graduate School of Social Work to the School of Social Work. In the two or three ensuing years the faculty of the school were given the direct responsibility for conducting an undergraduate program in juxtaposition to the graduate program, and began to recognize such questions as: "Should preparation for professional practice at the undergraduate level include the same heavy weighting in 'methods' as at the graduate level (e.g., how many methods courses, how much fieldwork)? What should be the job entry level of the graduate of the undergraduate program? Is the school watering down professional education? Is the school creating competition between holders of the bachelor's degree and holders of the master's degree in social work? Should undergraduate fieldwork require MSW supervision? If the undergraduate program is indeed a professional program in itself, should it be dominated by the professional goals of the graduate school?"

Today a central question lingers: "If we are preparing undergraduate students for professional practice, how does this differ from the way in which we are preparing graduate students?" Our observations of the agencies that employed our undergraduate students and the skills that the students were using suggested that their performance was similar to that of graduate students. The undergraduates were using skills, for the most part, that the faculty were teaching in the first graduate year. Admittedly it was difficult to differentiate at which level which skills were being used. This, as the social work world knows, remains an unanswered question, although we believe that considerable light has been shed on this during the last five years.

We then wondered if the faculty could teach at the undergraduate level essentially the same content that they were teaching in the first graduate year. If so, social workers would be able to obtain the same skills in a shorter period of time by combining undergraduate and graduate programs into a four-one arrangement (four undergraduate years and one graduate year).

Other models were being considered at that time. One of these was the program whereby undergraduates would be admitted to the graduate school after their junior year. This was identified in the professional literature as the "three-two model," just as Adelphi's was the "four-one model." It should be made clear that we recognized that offering the first graduate year at the undergraduate level was not the most creative approach to developing undergraduate education in social work, since it limits the possibilities for experimenting with the undergraduate curriculum. But it was not our intention to do anything but test the efficacy of reducing the total educational time from six to five years. That was the extent of our interest and the scope of our experiment.

Fully aware of the seriousness of manipulating the professional curriculum, and conscious of our responsibilities to the profession, we undertook to insure control by objective evaluation of the entire experiment. Massive amounts of time, energy, and federal money were poured into the evaluation process. To the extent possible, we remained in communication with San Diego State University and the University of Wisconsin–Madison—schools where similar experiments were being conducted.

With the publication of the Adelphi study, which extended over a six-year period from 1968 to 1974, and the San Diego and Wisconsin studies, which were published in 1972 and 1973,[1] the field now will have the benefit of extensive and well-documented research in which a total of about 350 undergraduate and graduate students participated.[2] Also, a number of follow-up studies have been completed, or are in the process of being completed at various schools such as Fordham University, Virginia Commonwealth University, and the Catholic University of America.[3]

The accelerated (four-one) program was institutionalized at the Adelphi School of Social Work in 1972. Since then we have made several changes. The summer internship was considered unnecessary and is no longer required. Modifications in the research requirements at the undergraduate level, as well as requirements with respect to ethnic content, have been made. In short, we have seen the value of continuing to make changes after the formal evaluation was completed and the results made available to the school. We would hope that this process of introducing change will continue in the future.

We believe that we have brought together the best possible professional faculty we could obtain to conduct the experiment. Sophie Wojciechowski, chairman of the Adelphi undergraduate social welfare program, has had many years of experience in administering undergraduate programs. She is as knowledgeable about undergraduate social work education as anyone in the country. Marianne Welter, the project director, and Aaron Rosenblatt, the research consultant, have long-established skills in teaching, curriculum management, and research. We maintained a close ongoing communication with Milton Wittman of the National Institute of Mental Health, who was able to sustain us both psychologically and fiscally toward the completion of the project and the preparation and publication of this volume. We view this not only as a successful experiment in curriculum building, but as a good example of cooperation between education, practice, and government in the expansion of knowledge.

---

[1] Paul Weinberger, "The Undergraduate Continuum Project: A Final Report," mimeographed (San Diego: School of Social Work, San Diego State University, 1972); and Alfred Kadushin and George Kelling, "Final Report: An Innovative Program in Social Work Education, the 3-2 Program," mimeographed (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin School of Social Work, 1973).

[2] Adelphi—121 students, Madison—98 students, and San Diego—130 students.

[3] See Sophie Wojciechowski, "Rethinking the Structure and Quality of Graduate and Undergraduate Social Work Education" (Paper presented at the Columbia University School of Social Work Alumni Conference, November 1, 1975).

After the experiment was completed, a new controversy arose in social work education with the publication of the Council on Social Work Education's report of the Task Force on Structure and Quality in Social Work Education.[4] This report has led to exacerbation of differences concerning the social work curriculum. We believe the findings of the Adelphi experiment have direct bearing upon the task force report. Although these findings do not support the recommendations of the task force in toto, we do believe that they support the efficacy, validity, and feasibility of the continuum in social work education defined as the mutual dependence upon the various levels of education for their mutual benefit. Simply put: if social work education is viewed on a continuum that recognizes and uses the interface between the various levels of education as a launching point for the improvement of the levels individually and together, it is desirable. Although it was designed to provide specific answers about the validity of the continuum, the Adelphi experiment nonetheless throws light upon questions about it.

For our colleagues in the academic corridors of social work, let me end these observations with what to me is one of the most rewarding outcomes of the experiment. Throughout the entire project, the cooperation, participation, and supportive interest of the entire faculty of the School of Social Work was superb. Also, 121 students in both the experimental and traditional groups participated. Their cooperation through taking extensive tests and responding to follow-up questionnaires made this project valid. The vitality with which the experiment was carried out was possible because the faculty was interested, supportive, and encouraging.

JOSEPH L. VIGILANTE
Dean
School of Social Work
Adelphi University

---

[4] *Report of the Task Force on Structure and Quality in Social Work Education* (New York: Council on Social Work Education, December 1974).

Acknowledgements

Over 200 persons made substantial contributions to this project. The majority of them are members of the Adelphi community. First of all we acknowledge the contribution of the undergraduate and graduate students. They donated many hours of their time during the before and after phases of data collection. They were generous in their cooperation at a difficult time. We are also pleased to acknowledge our indebtedness to their various fieldwork supervisors. They agreed to attend several training meetings on campus and, in addition, they carefully followed instructions in completing the lengthy form that was used to assess the students' fieldwork skills.

Three secretaries helped us during the life of the project—Evelyn Geddes, Mary Lumb, and Helen Slavin. The latter made a major contribution both as secretary and statistical assistant. The completion of this study would not have been possible for many years without the availability and cooperation of the Computer Center at Adelphi. The staff processed a mass of data for us with precision and good humor even at times when none of us felt like smiling.

We want to express deep appreciation to all members of the faculty at the Adelphi University School of Social Work. They agreed to take part in this educational experiment and that meant adding another demand to their heavily committed academic schedules. Some of them helped select the research instruments used in the study and some served as consultants on many occasions. Gunter Geis, Ruth Kantrow, and Gideon Horowitz read an earlier version of the final report and gave us the benefit of their comments.

Also, special appreciation is expressed to two key members of the Adelphi community: Joseph L. Vigilante, dean of the School of Social Work, and Beulah Rothman, associate dean. Their wholehearted support was unwavering during the length of the project. Without their assistance the study would never have achieved certain of its major goals.

It is appropriate to mention here the cooperation and interest of faculty who were in charge of other similar projects—Alfred Kadushin of the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and Irving Tebor, Donald Pilcher, and Paul Weinberger of San Diego State University. Their willingness to share

their material with us and to serve as consultants is greatly appreciated.

Financial support for the project was obtained from the National Institute of Mental Health, Social Work Training Branch. Milton Wittman was a model of what one prays to find in a federal administrator. It is with deep affection and respect that his many contributions are acknowledged.

We also want to mention support of a different nature that was obtained from the Council on Social Work Education. Its Commission on Accreditation approved of our plan for evaluating the experiment. Richard Lodge, the executive director, has been a friend for years. The study also benefited from the exceptionally fine editorial skill of Wallace Jalinske, CSWE's director of publications.

Contents

Page

Foreword iii

Acknowledgements vii

Chapter 1 *A Description of the Adelphi Accelerated Educational Program* 1
SOPHIE WOJCIECHOWSKI

Chapter 2 *Design of Evaluation* 11
AARON ROSENBLATT

Chapter 3 *Students in the Study* 31
MARIANNE WELTER

Chapter 4 *Changes in Students' Knowledge, Values, and Skill* 41
AARON ROSENBLATT

Chapter 5 *Educational Background and Practice Skill One Year After Graduation* 64
AARON ROSENBLATT

Chapter 6 *Coping with Feelings of Inferiority: Students' Experiences in the Accelerated Program* 76
AARON ROSENBLATT

Chapter 7 *Summary and Conclusions* 88
AARON ROSENBLATT

Appendix *Social Constraints Affecting the Interpretation of Findings in Evaluative Studies* 99
AARON ROSENBLATT

Bibliography 185

Chapter 1

A Description of the Adelphi Accelerated Educational Program

by Sophie Wojciechowski

Do accelerated students learn as much as traditional students? This report presents data on test results obtained from an experiment in accelerated social work education conducted at the Adelphi University School of Social Work. This six-year study, which began with a pilot study in 1968, was completed in 1974.

A significant change in thinking about social work education occurred between 1968 and 1975, the time when this report was being prepared. Formerly the MSW degree was the major professional degree in social work. Today the profession is moving fast toward granting several professional degrees. It is also developing a multilevel concept of social work education and practice. Thus the outcome of this experiment is more important today than it was eight years ago when a small band of leaders first conceived of the need for such a study.

At the inception of the accelerated educational program at Adelphi it was officially viewed as an experiment "outside of curriculum policy and accreditation standards," and therefore special approval had to be secured from the Council on Social Work Education. It was funded by the National Institute of Mental Health as an innovative educational experiment.

In those days many Adelphi faculty members viewed the program with considerable scepticism. Only a few years ago it was part of a "daring experiment;" today the experimental educational program has become an accepted model of social work education. It is in operation not only at Adelphi but also at a growing number of other schools.

In this monograph the final results of the Adelphi experiment are fully described for the first time. Previous progress reports were shared with the Adelphi faculty and the field at large on various occasions.[1] Reports from Adelphi, as well as findings from similar research programs in Madison and San Diego have provided social work educators with reasonable proof that a far-reaching reorganization of social work education is very much in order.

Now for the first time in the history of social work education the current debate on the undergraduate-graduate continuum has the benefit of extensive and well-documented research. All those who took part in these research projects hope that in the current heated discussions when issues of continuum and educational acceleration are being debated,[2] some of these objective research findings will be given proper attention.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Most schools of social work do not require a specific sequence of undergraduate courses for admission to graduate study. Some professions such as law, medicine, and nursing stress the importance of a continuum between undergraduate and graduate training. Not so social work. Students from any baccalaureate program can apply to graduate schools of social work. The profession, however, generally has stressed the importance of a broad liberal arts education as a base for graduate study.

The continuum issue received widespread attention in 1959 with the publication of *The Social Work Curriculum Study* by Werner Boehm. After reviewing undergraduate and graduate programs of social work education, Boehm's task force commented: "The project findings reveal that there [illegible] a good deal of unprofitable duplication between the undergraduate and graduate levels of education in social work today, particularly during the first year of graduate study."[3]

Most social work educators agreed that there was some duplication. Herbert Bisno offered some specific recommendations for improving the situation:

> it might be desirable to have the first professional social work degree awarded at the conclusion of an integrated undergraduate-graduate five-year program. We believe that the students completing such a program would at least be as well educated, and in all probability considerably better educated, than the products of the present two-year master's programs.
>
> Two points concerning this suggestion may need clarification and elaboration. First, we are definitely not suggesting a one-year graduate program. Rather we are thinking in terms of an integrated five-year program with social work content distributed over at least three of the five years.[4]

Several prominent social workers immediately challenged Bisno's recommendations. The major arguments for and against the accelerated program are summarized below.

Arguments for Acceleration

Proponents of an accelerated program stressed that:

1. An accelerated program might attract some excellent students who now choose to enter other professions. In allied professions such as education and clinical psychology, the master's degree is conferred after one year of graduate study. In social work the master's degree requires two years. The value of this additional year of study is not apparent; salary rewards commensurate with the cost of the added year of training are lacking. Such lack of visible rewards for an additional year of study may discourage some students from selecting social work as a career.
2. An accelerated program would help in some measure to alleviate the shortage of social workers by launching them on their professional careers one year earlier. (In 1959 this was a factor because there was a shortage of social workers.) Strengthening undergraduate programs also had other implications for alleviating the then existing shortage of social workers. Undergraduate students who majored in social welfare would be fully equipped to discharge certain professional responsibilities at the point of graduation. This was one of the reasons for strengthening the undergraduate program at San Diego State College[5] and Adelphi University.

Arguments Against Acceleration

The opponents of an accelerated program[6] leveled two major criticisms:

1. An accelerated program forces students to make premature decisions about their vocation. Consequently they are less likely to be committed to social work values than are students who enter graduate school without an undergraduate concentration in social work. The latter's commitment to social work becomes more meaningful because it is made after exposure to many other possible fields of study.
2. Graduates of accelerated programs would learn less than graduates of traditional programs. At least six years of education—four years on the undergraduate and two years on the graduate level—are needed to train a social worker. Even six years may not be enough time. Consequently this length of time should not be subject to any compression.

Since 1939 Adelphi University has offered social work programs to students. Undergraduate preprofessional social work training was started in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology. Ten years later in 1949 the Graduate School of Social Work was established.[7] In 1966 the University Curriculum Committee transferred the undergraduate social work courses to the School of Social Work and established a major in social welfare.

In 1967, under the leadership of Dean Joseph L. Vigilante, the faculty began to explore several educational alternatives. They were aware of the rapid acceleration of knowledge and the capacity of undergraduate students to acquire knowledge that was once considered advanced. Therefore the faculty raised these questions: Could not much of what traditionally passed for graduate education be learned at the undergraduate level? If so, how much of the present curriculum should remain a part of the graduate program? How much of the graduate program more properly belonged at the undergraduate level? (This kind of redistribution would allow more advanced content to be introduced in the master's curriculum.) How might unnecessary duplication be avoided between undergraduate and graduate programs?

Rather than debate the answers to these questions endlessly, the Adelphi faculty sought permission to engage in an empirical study of the issues. In June 1968 the Commission on Accreditation of the Council on Social Work Education issued permission to the Adelphi University School of Social Work to develop an educational continuum "outside of curriculum policy and accreditation standards" and to measure the results against the traditional MSW program.

The National Institute of Mental Health granted the school a small grant to engage a researcher to develop a research proposal for the project. In May 1968 Aaron Rosenblatt completed a research proposal that was subsequently submitted to NIMH. This organization then made a research grant to the school for a "Pilot Experiment in Accelerated Continuum." The initial research design called for a five-year study from the fall of 1968 to the spring of 1973. Later, each study period was extended for an additional year. This extension made possible an investigation of the students' adjustment to the field of practice one year after graduation.

THE ACCELERATED CURRICULUM

While the research design was being developed by Rosenblatt (see Chapter 2) the faculty was engaged in building a meaningful curriculum reflecting the continuum between the BSW program and the accelerated master's program. The Adelphi curriculum was built on the assumption that social work education must be offered within the context of a broad liberal arts program. After carefully examining the range of undergraduate courses offered at the university, the faculty selected those that provided students with such an educational base.

All students interested in the undergraduate social welfare program were asked to devote the first two years of their education to a general liberal arts program. Within this period they completed most requirements of the four divisions of the liberal arts curriculum, that is, language and literature, social science, natural science, and the arts (see Table 1-1).[8]

By the end of the sophomore year students were asked to make a decision about their future professional education. To aid them the services of an academic advisor were made available. Qualified students who elected to major in social welfare were admitted to the program in their junior year.

The curriculum design for the accelerated program was based on the following three assumptions: (1) that the first year of the traditional master's program could be learned in the junior and senior years of undergraduate education and in an intensive post-baccalaureate summer session, (2) that this could be accomplished without altering the substance of the social work curriculum, and (3) that this change could be introduced without jeopardizing the liberal arts base of undergraduate education.

The accelerated program resulted in the development of a defined continuum between undergraduate and graduate social work education. During the junior and senior years students were essentially covering the educational content of the first year of the master's program, while at the same time completing their liberal arts requirements. At the end of four years, students participating in this program received a BS degree in social welfare, and at the end of five years, an MS degree in social work. Table 1-2 compares the first-year master's program with the accelerated undergraduate-graduate continuum. The following describes the contents of the table:

1. *Social welfare policy and services sequence.* The identical content of the two-semester master's course was taught to students in their junior year. The two groups of students met in separate sections. Although the undergraduate sections met twice a week (the graduate sections met only once a week) they were taught by the same faculty. Also, all students were given the same assignments.[9]
2. *Human behavior and social environment sequence.* The two-semester master's course was offered to students in their senior year. They met together with graduate students weekly for two hours. Most faculty members were not aware of any difference in the educational level of their students.
3. *Methods of social work practice.* This two-semester course for senior students provided the same content taught in the first semester of the social work practice course referred to as "common method" in the master's program. In the accelerated program, the teaching of methods followed a pattern that was part of the school's curriculum. In their senior year accelerated students were introduced to the methods of social work practice in a common methods course. During the 12-week internship, they were required to take a second semester in their method of concentration (Casework II or Group Work II). This educational design did not make provision for students concen-

TABLE 1-1
Educational Requirements for the Baccalaureate Degree in Social Welfare and the Accelerated Master's Program

1. Requirements for Baccalaureate Degree in Social Welfare

	Credits
Language and Literature	
English 1-2, composition	6
English 41, American literature	3
English 42, American literature	3
English 15, living issues in literature[a]	3
Foreign Language[a]	6
	21
Natural Sciences	
Biology 7-8, introduction to biology	8
Math 1 or 11, introductory college math	4
Biology 10, genetics, evolution, and man[a]	4
	16
Social Sciences and Humanities	
Sociology 1, introduction to sociology	3
Sociology 2, social organization	3
Sociology 106, development of sociological thought	3
Sociology A or B, select one from group A or one from group B[a]	3
Anthropology 11, introduction to cultural anthropology	3
Anthropology 12, introduction to physical anthropology[a]	3
Anthropology 142, advanced cultural anthropology[a]	3
Political Science 5, introduction to political science	3
Political Science 16 or 31, American government and public policy or American constitutional law[a]	3
Economics 1, economic principles	3
Economics 2, economic principles	3
History 1, introduction to western civilization	3
History 2, introduction to western civilization	3
Psychology 1, general psychology	3
Psychology 2, advanced general psychology	3
Psychology 62, social psychology[a]	3
Philosophy 11, introduction to philosophy[a]	3
	51
Arts	
Art 7, introduction to the arts	3
Art, music, dance, drama, speech (one to be elected)	3
	6
Social Welfare	
Soc. 100 and 101, research method and sociological statistics[b]	6
SW 30, history and philosophy of social welfare	3

	Credits
SW 31, organization of social welfare services	3
SW 100, Human Behavior and Social Environment I	3
SW 101, Human Behavior and Social Environment II	3
SW 102, seminar in Common Methods I and social welfare laboratory (8 hours of fieldwork a week)	4
SW 103, seminar in Common Methods II and social welfare laboratory (8 hours of fieldwork a week)	4
Total for BS—120 (21+16+51+6+26)	26
2. Postbaccalaureate Summer Session—12 weeks	
SW 221, Social Casework II	3
SW 246, Social Group Work II	3
SW 291, field instruction (28 hours a week = 336 hrs.)	8
	14

3. Students in the Accelerated Program follow the same second-year master's program as regular students

Second-Year Master's Program

	Credits
First Semester	
For Casework Students SW 320, Social Casework III *For Groupwork Students* Social Group Work III	3
For All Students	
SW 212, Human Behavior and Social Environment III	3
SW 236, organization of social welfare services (social development)	3
SW 357, Social Work Research II	3
SW 390, Field Instruction III	6
Elective[a]	3
	21
Second Semester	
For Casework Students SW 321, seminar in social casework *For Groupwork Students* SW 248,[b] seminar in social groupwork	3
For All Students	
SW 301, seminar in social welfare	3
SW 391, field instruction IV	6
Elective	3
Total for MSW— 76 (26+14+21+15)	15

---

[a] Elective may be substituted for this course.

[b] Fulfills requirements of Social Work Research I.

TABLE 1-2
Comparison of Curriculum for Students in the Accelerated and Traditional Program

Sequence and Course Title	Accelerated Program	Traditional Program
1. *Social Welfare Policy and Services*		
History & Philosophy of Social Welfare	SW30—1st Semester Junior	SW200—1st Semester
Organization of Social Welfare Services	SW31—2nd Semester Junior	SW235—2nd Semester
2. *Human Behavior and Social Environment*		
Human Behavior and Social Environment I	SW100—1st Semester Senior	SW210—1st Semester
Human Behavior and Social Environment II	SW101—2nd Semester Senior	SW211—2nd Semester
3. *Methods of Social Work Practice*		
Common Methods Course	SW102—1st Semester Senior SW103—2nd Semester Senior	SW220EX—1st Semester
Social Casework II and/or Social Groupwork II	SW221 and/or SW246—Summer Session[a] (12 wks.)	SW221 and/or SW246—2nd Semester
4. *Social Work Research*		
Social Work Research I	S100—Research Methods S101—Sociological Statistics	SW257—2nd Semester
5. *Field Instruction*		
Field Instruction I	SW102—1st Semester Senior 8 hrs. a week 120	SW290—1st Semester 24 hrs. a wk........ 300
	SW103—2nd Semester Senior 8 hrs. a week 120	
	SW291—Summer Session 28 hrs. a week 336	SW291—2nd Semester 24 hrs. a wk........ 300
	Total 576	Total 600

---

[a] This special 12-week summer session is different from the regular 6-week summer session of the University College.

trating in community organization.[10] In the second year of the master's program, accelerated students had the same options as traditional students. For example, they could elect a second method other than their method of concentration.

4. *Social work research.* Only one research course was required of traditional students. The accelerated continuum did not include a special course in social work research. Instead, students were required to take two sociology courses on research methods and statistics, which were considered equivalent to the research course offered in the first year of the master's program.
5. *Field instruction.* A similar number of hours was offered to accelerated and traditional students. However, the distribution of fieldwork differed. During the senior year, students spent one day a week in the field for a total of 240 hours. During the summer internship, they were required to spend 28 hours a week in the field, or a total of 336 hours for the term. Thus the total fieldwork time of 576 hours was close to the 600 hours required of students in the first year of the traditional program.

In summary, the accelerated curriculum was designed to provide an educational experience equivalent to but not identical with that obtained in the two-year graduate curriculum. There were obvious differences between the two programs. Whether or not these affected the performance of students would be determined by the research study that was a significant component of the Adelphi experiment.

OUTLINE OF THE MONOGRAPH

This section outlines the plan followed in presenting the data obtained from the evaluation. Chapter 2 contains a careful statement of the goals of the research study and the problems encountered in presenting research findings on a controversial subject. In addition, the instruments used in the study are described and the before and after findings for the entire group of students are used as evidence to support the validity of the instruments.

Chapter 3 deals with the procedures that were used to select accelerated and traditional students. After that, selected characteristics of the two groups of students are compared to determine whether or not any of the differences noted are statistically significant. This chapter also contains a detailed statement of the procedures used to ensure the cooperation of students and supervisors. Their cooperation had to be earned. Much thought was given to planning ways first to obtain and then to maintain a commitment to the research component.

The next two chapters, 4 and 5, are primarily devoted to the presentation of quantitative data from the evaluative study. Chapter 4 contains comparisons of accelerated and traditional students regarding changes in knowledge, value, and skill that occurred from the start to the completion of their training. In Chapter 5 the data are presented comparing the students' academic characteristics and their practice skill one year after they had graduated. These two chapters complete the presentation of the quantitative data.

Chapter 6 contains data from a qualitative study of the students' experience in the accelerated program. The students were interviewed in small groups at the completion of their training. At that point they were asked to analyze their experience and report on the positive and negative aspects of the accelerated program.

Chapter 7 is the final chapter. Here the findings of the entire study are reviewed and some conclusions are set forth for the reader's consideration.

NOTES

1. San Francisco, February 25–28, 1973; Madison, Wis., June 11–13, 1973; and Atlanta, March 10–13, 1974.

2. Herbert Bisno, *The Place of the Undergraduate Curriculum in Social Work Education,* Curriculum Study, Vol. II (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1959).

3. Werner Boehm, *Objectives of the Social Work Curriculum of the Future,* Curriculum Study, Vol. I (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1959).

4. Bisno, *op. cit.*

5. The School of Social Work at San Diego State College designed a series of studies to evaluate the effect of the undergraduate program. The designs are set forth in "A Model Project," mimeographed (San Diego: San Diego State College School of Social Work, 1968).

6. Florence Hollis, "The Implications of the Curriculum Study for Social Work," *Journal of Jewish Communal Service,* Vol. 37 (1960), pp. 135–42; Ruth Smalley, "Reaction to the Curriculum Study," *Social Work,* Vol. 4 (1959), pp. 105–107; and Charlotte Towle, "Objectives for the Social Work Curriculum for the Future," *Social Service Review,* Vol. 33 (1959), pp. 362–87.

7. The MSW was accredited by the Council on Social Work Education in 1951.

8. During the 1970s, when many university students were demanding more freedom in structuring their own educational choices, the above requirements were considerably "liberated," giving students more options and more electives. Students interested in the social welfare major did not protest against the fairly strict educational requirements. They understood that a structured curriculum was a part of professional education and that it provided them with the knowledge base needed for social work practice.

9. In a brief research study a comparison was made of the ratings of final papers for both graduate and undergraduate groups. The results showed no significant differences.

10. At the time the continuum was developed, the Community Organization Sequence was in the process of reorganization.

Chapter 2

Design of Evaluation

by Aaron Rosenblatt

The purpose of the Adelphi study was mandated from the date of its inception in 1968. It was to compare the amount of learning taking place in accelerated and traditional programs of social work education. On the basis of the findings a recommendation would be made regarding the future of accelerated programs of education. Before presenting the major elements of the study design, a few words need to be said about the use of action research, of which the Adelphi study is an example.

THE USE OF ACTION RESEARCH

The results of the present study, and those of studies conducted at San Diego and Wisconsin may not settle the controversy about accelerated education. Some readers may question the validity of the findings on methodological grounds. They may have strong doubts about the ways in which the data were collected. Or they may have serious questions about the researcher's interpretation of the data.[1]

Some objections are, of course, legitimate. No study design is perfect. Furthermore, compromises and modifications always occur in the conduct of an empirical study. For these reasons all studies should be subjected to critical scrutiny. However, proponents and opponents in a controversial issue often tend to take a different approach. First they read the findings carefully. If these fail to confirm their beliefs they comb through the section on methodology looking for soft spots. There they are sure to find some basis for leveling charges against the validity of the study findings. Essentially they are seeking to discredit the information. Their scholarship becomes a weapon used in defense of their beliefs.

A researcher cannot solve all the problems that arise in conducting an evaluation study to everyone's satisfaction. The problem of measurement is particularly nettlesome. All that a researcher can hope to do is to select an instrument from the limited stock of those currently available that is either "better" or "less bad." Even the best instruments available for evaluating social work education are far from perfect. This should be openly acknowledged.

In a sense, the researcher asks his readers to enter into a contract with him. On the one hand he pledges to state his problems and to describe the way he tried to solve them. If the findings are too seriously flawed to be heeded, the researcher should warn his readers. Under these conditions, one may question whether the researcher should bother to publish or distribute the results.

On the other hand, the researcher makes this request of his readers: "I have been honest with you. Now I ask you to be fair in evaluating this inquiry. Decide whether or not you will give credence to the findings on the basis of the logic of the inquiry. Don't postpone this decision until after you have read the findings and you have learned whether or not these support your beliefs."

We ask the readers of this study to enter into such a contract. Read the section on method carefully. Then decide whether or not you will be able to accept the findings. Reach this decision *before* you read the section on findings.

METHOD: SCOPE AND RATIONALE

Two preliminary questions need to be addressed in the early stages of an evaluative study: What is it that is to be studied? and How are data of this nature to be obtained? Let us address these questions seriatim.

The first and most important part of this study deals with the evaluation of the accelerated program as compared with the traditional master's program. At an early point we decided to confine ourselves to the measurement of learning that was taking place in accordance with the objectives of the curriculum of the Adelphi University School of Social Work. We did not question the construction of the two curricula, or the goals of graduate education. We were intent on measuring the comparative effect on students of two similar yet somewhat different educational programs without seeking to establish which of the two might produce more effective social workers.

In our view, the effectiveness of students in their practice as social workers is to a considerable degree affected by matters other than the information and knowledge they acquire as students. Indeed, we suspect that their effectiveness as social workers will depend in large measure on the kind of person they are when they enter the school of social work. Their past experiences, warmth, empathy, and understanding are crucial elements in helping clients.[2] These qualities are not acquired as a result of attending a school of social work. The school recognizes the importance of these attributes, but it does not presume to reshape the personality of the student. Instead, it tries to select for admission to the school those applicants who have a sufficient store of the needed qualities to perform satisfactorily.

We made a decision to restrict this study to measuring the learning taking place in students. This learning was to be in accord with the formal objectives of the curriculum. The study undoubtedly would have been more interesting if we had tried to cast a wider net and also evaluated the informal learning taking place, regardless of whether it was in accord with curriculum objectives. For example, we might have attempted to include a study of the effectiveness with which students learn to circumvent agency procedures, or the way students decide to complete certain assignments and to ignore others. This selectivity in completing reading assignments is a skill all students acquire. They cannot complete all of these and survive, let alone remain healthy.

Also, we might have studied the ways in which students learn to cope once they encounter difficulties with their supervisors. Unfortunately, we did not plan to study all of the learning that takes place as students go through the process of coming to think of themselves as capable social workers,[3] and this kind of data was not collected. At the time we were designing the present study the prospect of evaluating solely the learning of information and skills in regard to the formal objectives seemed almost overwhelming.

Now let us consider the second question, which was posed earlier: How are the data to be obtained? Because of our interest in measuring the amount of learning in the two programs, we were compelled to make use of a "before-and-after" research design. An "after only" study would not provide information on the amount of learning that occurs during the course of study. To make appropriate interpretations about the amount of learning, before and after measures are needed. (The interpretation of after only measures is, of course, extremely hazardous.)

We also favored the before-and-after design for another reason. We did not wish to assume that the goals of education were being reached simply because there were classrooms, teachers, students, textbooks, and other signs that proclaimed one was in the presence of a flourishing educational enterprise.

Omar Khayyam, an eleventh century poet and mathematician, warned us in these words to be wary of educational appearances:

> Myself when young did eagerly frequent
> Doctor and Saint, and heard great argument
> About it and about: but evermore
> Came out by the same door where in I went.

Thus we made use of a panel design, which is described in some detail later in this chapter. Baseline measures were obtained from accelerated and traditional students at the start of their training. Both groups of students were then measured two years later.

A second part of the study resulted from the suggestion of a consultant from the funding agency. Here we studied the practice of students one year after graduation. It was possible that changes in the social work practice of accelerated and traditional students might become visible only after the passage of time. Therefore the suggestion was made that the practice of students be assessed one year after they had graduated.

This aspect of the evaluation study was more difficult to control than the first part. For example, Adelphi had no control over the quality of the agency at which students chose to work after graduation. Also, the school had no control over the level of supervision students obtained after graduation. In addition, one could anticipate that there would be greater attrition in following students once they had left school.

These and other uncontrolled factors may have affected the results of the follow-up. Therefore we have less confidence in the results of this phase of the evaluation. These problems, while significant, were not so great that the study results have no value.

The third part of the study was peripheral to our main interest. Under investigation here were differences in the background characteristics of students who were attracted to the accelerated and traditional programs. Before the experiment in accelerated education began, a few prominent social work educators expressed considerable concern that students attracted to such programs would be tainted by a heavily vocational orientation and that a strong liberal arts background was a preferable preparation for social workers. This concern was first voiced 15 years ago, before the advent of career ladder programs and the granting of college credit for job experiences. Today this concern sounds old-fashioned. Quite apart from its fashionableness, however, differences in the liberal arts background of students may bear little relationship to achieving the goals of the curriculum.[4] Our present view about the value of this third part of the study emerged only after the study was under way. Initially, we believed the question had more merit. Some readers may still consider that the matter is important and that the findings bearing upon this issue are valuable.

In summary, this evaluation study of the accelerated program at Adelphi was designed to answer three questions:

1. Did accelerated and traditional students differ in the amount of formal learning they acquired during their training?
2. Did accelerated and traditional students differ in their practice one year after graduation?
3. Were there differences in the educational background of students enrolled in the accelerated and traditional programs?

Most of the resources and instruments in this study were devoted to answering the first question. In the next section we shall describe the instruments selected and then we shall consider the panel design that was used in collecting data.

MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

The major purpose of the evaluation was to compare the amount of learning acquired by students in the accelerated and traditional programs. Thus it was important to decide upon areas in which learning was expected to take place. As a guide we used the statement of objectives set forth in the Adelphi *Self-Study for Accreditation Review*.

> The curriculum and general climate of the school provide learning experiences designed to develop self-awareness and to heighten the student's commitment to social work values, his motivation to give service and his recognition of change as a dynamic factor in human relations and social institutions. The curriculum brings him knowledge of people, their problems, the programs of social welfare and the application of technical methods to the solutions of problems of social welfare.
>
> The educational program prepares the student to translate knowledge, values and skills into disciplined professional social work practice for the purpose of restoration, maintenance and enhancement of social functioning.[5]

This statement was used to specify the following areas of social work education in which learning and commitment were expected to take place:

1. Foundation Knowledge (social welfare policy and services, human behavior and the social environment).
2. Knowledge of Social Work Practice (social work methods, social work research).
3. Social Work Values.
4. Practice Skills and Field Performance.

It was important to obtain data in each area, for learning was supposed to take place in all of them. Nor was one area considered preeminent in importance. The delineation of areas for study was similar to that made by Samuel Bloom in his evaluation of psychiatric teaching: "you have knowledge, you have skill, you have attitudes and values, and you have behavior . . . you can't use any one index or indicator for all of the others."[6]

The instruments finally selected for use in this study were the result of a careful search aimed at locating satisfactory tools of measurement.[7] Part of the general strategy was to use instruments containing a large number of items. Thus students would have difficulty remembering a number of particular items from the first test to the retest. In addition, a large pool of items was likely to be more comprehensive than a small pool.

On the basis of a pilot study, we decided to use tests that could be scored objectively. Before the evaluation began at Adelphi, as part of the NIMH grant we had conducted a small study on faculty rating of students' essays. These ratings were made without any extensive discussion with faculty. They were simply asked to rate the essays in their usual manner. The results showed such low reliability that we abandoned any further efforts to use essay questions.[8]

As part of our search to locate satisfactory instruments we examined the literature on measurements and also consulted with colleagues at San Diego State College, the University of Wisconsin–Madison, and the University of Michigan. From the stock of instruments available we selected those we believed to be most suited for use at Adelphi.

At this point the project director met with chairpersons from the various sequences at the school or their appointed representatives. With one exception they approved of or selected the instrument to be used in the study. The chairperson of the Human Behavior and the Social Environment sequence was not fully satisfied with one instrument. To make up for its deficiencies she prepared an additional group of questions. These were subsequently administered to students taking part in the evaluation.

It would have been preferable to develop a special set of instruments expressly for use in this study. Not enough time, however, was available for such an enterprise to be undertaken. Therefore obtaining approval from the chairpersons was an important precaution and ensured that the instruments were, from their informed perspective, satisfactory and that they appeared to be suitable for measuring the kind of learning expected to take place at Adelphi.

Information about the reliability and validity of these instruments will be recounted later. In addition to making use of this information, we sought to validate the instruments for Adelphi students by examining the combined results of accelerated and traditional students obtained at the start and at the completion of the study.

We reasoned that an instrument able to show significant increments in learning was suitable for use in the study. If we could demonstrate that the instruments were capable of registering increments in learning, this would contribute substantially to the validity of the evaluation. The Wisconsin study devoted to instrumentation had foundered because the students examined had failed to show such change.[9] When an instrument does not register change from one period to another, one cannot, of course, assume that the instrument is defective. Increments in learning may not be registered simply because no substantial degree of learning is occurring—no matter how desirable the goal or how laudable the effort and planning expended.

Instruments that register increments from the start to the completion of an educational program have a compelling quality about them. After describing each instrument, we shall also include the before-and-after findings for the entire group of 108 students who took part in the evaluation study.

Obviously, findings were not known to us when we undertook the study. Initially we had some question about presenting the findings in this chapter of the report instead of in the next one. We decided to present them here for two reasons: first, the evaluation was not designed for the purpose of validating the instruments used. Therefore the results obtained for the total group of students do not belong in the chapters devoted to findings. Second, the before-and-after data for all students are useful to the reader at this point in the presentation. These data may help him decide whether or not to accept the findings that deal with the comparative effectiveness of the accelerated and traditional programs.

FOUNDATION KNOWLEDGE

Foundation knowledge was measured by two instruments, the Minnesota Inventory of Social Work Knowledge,[10] and the Study of Barry Black.[11] The inventory is made up of 85 multiple-choice items. The following subject areas are covered: history and philosophy (19 items), social policies and issues (10 items), social security and social welfare (14 items), fields of social work and social welfare (13 items), profession of social work (11 items); and practice of social work (18 items).[12] The t-test values and the levels of significance for these six parts appear in Table 2-1. All of these values were well below the .05 level of significance (two-tailed). The .05 level of significance was selected for use in this study.[13] The values of the t-test show that learning in the foundation area of knowledge was being measured by the Minnesota Inventory of Social Work Knowledge. (The crucial question to be answered in Chapter 4 is whether or not there was a significant difference between the learning of accelerated and traditional students.)

TABLE 2-1
t-Test Values for the Minnesota Inventory of Social Work Knowledge (N=108)

Section	*t-Test Value*	*Level of Statistical Significance*
History and Philosophy	7.60	<.05
Social Policies and Issues	8.21	<.05
Social Security and Social Welfare	7.21	<.05
Fields of Social Work	6.88	<.05
Profession of Social Work	3.83	<.05
Practice of Social Work	5.57	<.05
Total	11.64	<.05

Students' knowledge of the application of human behavior and the social environment was measured by the Study of Barry Black. Barry is a 15-year old boy who is troubled in several areas of his life. After reading a 1,000 word summary, the student is asked to answer 28 questions dealing with diagnosis. He then answers 17 questions about efforts to improve the situation. The student receives an additional amount of information based on a home visit to Barry Black's mother. After reading this summary, the student answers an additional 22 questions on diagnosis and 15 on treatment. The third and final section contains information obtained from visiting Barry's high school and talking to various school personnel. The student then is asked to answer 21 questions on diagnosis and 20 on treatment. Altogether the case summary is approximately 3,000 words long. Ninety minutes is suggested as the maximum time necessary for careful analysis of the case material.

The chairperson of the Human Behavior and Social Environment sequence at the school believed that the study of Barry Black needed to be supplemented by additional questions that reflected the objectives of the Adelphi sequence. She prepared an additional 21 items, divided into two parts, concerned with "psychosocial dynamic mechanisms affecting behavior." Six of the items are specific for the study of Barry Black and the other 15 of a more general character.[14]

The t-test values and the levels of significance for the study of Barry Black appear in Table 2-2.

All of the values with one exception show that learning was taking place from the start to the completion of social work training. The additional items prepared by Bertha Gronfein were particularly useful in reflecting the program of instruction at Adelphi.

TABLE 2-2
t-Test Values for the Study of Barry Black (N=108)

Section	*t-Test Value*	*Level of Statistical Significance*
Diagnosis	3.07	<.05
Treatment	1.09	ns
Total	3.35	<.05
Specific Psychosocial Items	2.75	<.05
General Psychosocial Items	7.64	<.05

KNOWLEDGE OF SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH

Knowledge of and attitudes toward social work research were measured by a test devised by Harris K. Goldstein, the Measurement of Attitudes and Research Knowledge (MARK).[15] The form used in the Adelphi study was revised in June 1968. The test is divided into questions dealing with both knowledge and attitudes. The 34 multiple-choice questions deal with such specific information as "A frequency distribution in research usually refers to . . ." and such attitudes as "Do you find research (1) absorbing and engrossing? (2) stimulating and informative? (3) tedious and boring? (4) distasteful and repelling?" The final 12 questions consist of a word or phrase which must be matched with the appropriate definition or description of it.

Three factors were identified in this instrument by *means of* a factor analysis: (1) knowledge of quantitative concepts and quantitative relationships and of precise differences in concepts, (2) knowledge of abstract ideas, and (3) the student's confidence in the ability of science to solve problems, or the preference by the student for a knowledge-based versus a practice-based approach to practice. Studies conducted in 1968 and 1972 showed a value of .40 and .34 for predicting course grades.

The t-test values and the levels of significance for the Goldstein MARK instrument appear in Table 2-3.

The values in Table 2-3 show that students were registering decrements in attitude toward research. This finding should not be surprising. A previous study of social workers, some of whom were students at Adelphi, showed their low evaluation not only of social work research but also of courses on social work research. MARK also showed that students were, nonetheless, acquiring knowledge about research.[16]

TABLE 2-3
t-Test Values for the Goldstein MARK Test (N=108)

Section	*t-Test Value*	*Level of Statistical Significance*
Attitudes	−2.2242	<.05
Attitudes and Knowledge	−1.2532	ns
Knowledge	4.8894	<.05
Total	2.4416	<.05

SOCIAL WORK VALUES

The revised version of the Social Values Test was selected for use with students. This test was developed in 1960 by Henry J. Meyer, with the collaboration of Donna L. McLeod. Edgar Borgatta aided in the revisions that were completed in 1962. The 40 items that comprise this test assess the position of students on ten relatively independent dimensions of social values. Each item is framed as a declarative statement. For example, students are asked to express the extent of their agreement or disagreement with statements of the following type: "The Federal Government is going too far towards creating a 'Welfare State.'"

The ten dimensions shown in Table 2-4 are tapped in this test. Four items are used to express each dimension.[17]

The values reached the .05 level of statistical significance only for two dimensions. The direction of change was negative for both of them; that is, attachment to the social work value was weaker at the completion of training. These findings do not in any way prove that the Social Values Test is not valid. Schools may not be successfully "teaching" values to social work students. The results of a study by Barbara Varly also showed a decline in social work values from the start to the completion of the student's final education.[18]

A more detailed analysis and interpretation of the findings from the Social Values Test are presented in Chapter 4. The point to be made here is that the test may be measuring values, but relatively little change is occurring there. If this is so, we must not look for another test; we must begin to think about changing our ideas about the place of values in social work education.

PRACTICE SKILLS AND FIELD PERFORMANCE

Practice skills and field performance were measured by the Practice Skill Assessment Instrument (PSAI).[19] This instrument was developed at the University of Michigan School of Social Work under the direction of Rosemary C. Sarri. Preliminary analysis of data conducted by Elizabeth Navarre and Rosemary Sarri showed that this instrument was able to do the following: to discriminate between the work of "A" and "B" students, and to discriminate between the work of first- and fourth-semester students.[20]

This instrument differs from those described above in one important respect, scores are obtained not from student responses but from supervisors' ratings of student performance. Because students usually have two different placements, one supervisor rates the student at the start and another at the completion of training. Supervisors were trained in the use of the instrument at special meetings conducted by Marianne Welter (see Chapter 3). Ratings varied from a low of 1 to a high of 9. A rating of 1 indi-

TABLE 2-4
t-Test Values for the Meyer Social Values Test (N=108)

Dimension	t-Test Value	Level of Statistical Significance
1. Public aid vs. private effort	0.40	ns
2. Personal freedom vs. societal control	1.26	ns
3. Personal goals vs. maintenance of group	1.70	ns
4. Social causation vs. individual autonomy	0.73	ns
5. Pluralism vs. homogeneity	−2.68	<.05
6. Secularism vs. religiosity	1.35	ns
7. Self-determinism vs. fatalism	0.17	ns
8. Positive satisfaction vs. struggle-denial	0.92	ns
9. Social protection vs. social retribution	−0.64	ns
10. Innovation-change vs. traditionalism	−2.07	<.05
Total	−0.40	ns

cated that "behavior is not present in situations where the presence of the behavior is appropriate," while 9 indicated that "behavior is always present when appropriate." The 77-item instrument covers these areas: community (4 items), agency (7 items), student (9 items), the individual client (18 items), casework (19 items), and groupwork (20 items).[21]

The t-test values and the levels of significance for the Practice Skill Assessment Instrument appear in Table 2-5.

The values shown were strong and consistent. They indicated that the PSAI was capable of registering change in fieldwork performance. One must, however, consider whether or not the ratings were contaminated by the supervisor's knowledge of the students' location in the two programs and of the students' year of training. Such information was known to all supervisors. There was no way in which it could have been withheld from them.

In the training sessions conducted by Welter, supervisors were asked to lay aside any personal feelings they may have harbored about the value of accelerated education. She asked them to be as fair as possible in making their ratings.

Another possibility for obtaining ratings would have been for the researchers to have employed raters, to have trained them, and to have

TABLE 2-5
t-Test Values for the Practice Skill Assessment Instrument (N=108)

Item Number	*t-Test Value*	*Level of Statistical Significance*	*Item Number*	*t-Test Value*	*Level of Statistical Significance*	*Item Number*	*t-Test Value*	*Level of Statistical Significance*
1	11.31	<.05	20	6.41	<.05	39	9.97	<.05
2	10.89	<.05	21	12.20	<.05	40	10.21	<.05
3	8.71	<.05	22	11.19	<.05	41	8.53	<.05
4	13.43	<.05	23	10.24	<.05	42	9.93	<.05
5	12.34	<.05	24	9.79	<.05	43	10.11	<.05
6	10.86	<.05	25	12.36	<.05	44	10.73	<.05
7	8.35	<.05	26	10.62	<.05	45	10.96	<.05
8	8.09	<.05	27	10.68	<.05	46	10.20	<.05
9	4.00	<.05	28	10.57	<.05	47	9.59	<.05
10	5.19	<.05	29	11.40	<.05	48	9.51	<.05
11	7.29	<.05	30	10.40	<.05	49	10.63	<.05
12	8.25	<.05	31	11.11	<.05	50	9.11	<.05
13	8.85	<.05	32	12.82	<.05	51	9.13	<.05
14	7.98	<.05	33	9.63	<.05	52	8.99	<.05
15	8.11	<.05	34	10.32	<.05	53	8.35	<.05
16	9.50	<.05	35	9.70	<.05	54	8.40	<.05
17	10.56	<.05	36	8.21	<.05	55	8.52	<.05
18	10.90	<.05	37	9.03	<.05	56	8.93	<.05
19	6.47	<.05	38	10.02	<.05	57	9.17	<.05

asked them to make ratings without any prior information about students. Although feasible, this approach raises other serious problems. How can a suitable sample of the students' performance be captured? How are the raters to acquire an intimate and extensive knowledge of the students' field performance? In our judgment, the preferable procedure was to train supervisors to rate the performance of their students.

In summary, the before-and-after data show that the instruments were able to measure learning taking place at Adelphi. Learning was more consistent in some areas than in others but this kind of variation was to be expected. Social work students were most concerned about their fieldwork performance and change was most pronounced there. Social work students had little interest in research. They showed gains in knowledge but losses in their attitude toward research. Students' social values failed to show improvement. These findings, however, do not prove that the test is invalid.[22]

ONE YEAR AFTER INSTRUMENT

Before-and-after data were not collected for other instruments that were used in the evaluation. A description of these instruments follows: the One Year After Instrument is similar to the Practice Skill Assessment Instrument. The same 9-point scale is used and the same anchoring descriptions are used for each point of the scale. The major difference, of course, is that the person being rated is a graduate social worker rather than a student. This change in status necessitates a number of changes in the wording of individual items. For example, item 4 of the PSAI reads as follows: "[The student] can describe the role of the professional social worker and the method of service to professional and lay persons in the agency and community." This item was changed to reflect a more demanding role: "[The worker] satisfactorily interprets the role of the professional social worker to professional and lay persons."

A few items were omitted entirely and new ones were substituted. Overall, these changes were relatively minor. Nonetheless, their importance was considerable. The shift in wording from student to worker meant that an entirely different standard was being used to make ratings of skills and performance. It was appropriate to compare the first and second ratings while the student remained a student. The third rating when the student was a graduate social worker stands alone. That is, the one year after ratings were not compared with the earlier one as an indication of *progress*, but were used solely to compare the practice performance of graduates of the accelerated and traditional programs.

INITIAL DIFFERENCES IN STUDENTS

Some faculty feared that the liberal arts background of students would be weakened in an accelerated program. More specifically, they anticipated that the undergraduate education of students might become unduly technical or—even worse from their perspective—vocational. Three kinds of measures were used to collect information on initial differences in students:

1. *Students' undergraduate transcript.* An undergraduate transcript of grades was available in the students' admission folder. This information was used in determining the number of courses in anthropology, economics, government, political science, psychology, social science, and sociology that students had enrolled in as undergraduates. The transcript was also used to determine the grade point average of accelerated and traditional students.
2. *Students' aptitude test scores.* The Graduate Record Examination was used as another indicator of the liberal arts background that students had acquired from their undergraduate education. The test is described as follows in the official GRE manual:

   > The Aptitude Test is a three-hour test of general scholastic ability at the graduate level. It measures the basic verbal and mathematical abilities that a student has acquired over many years.
   >
   > The Aptitude Test is basically a measure of ability and . . . attempts to measure skills acquired over a long period of time and not related to a specific field of study.[23]

   The validity of the Graduate Record Examination has been under widespread attack recently. Indeed, this was the only test to which students voiced strong objections. With this single exception their cooperation in taking part in the lengthy research battery was more than expected. In this study the GRE was not used to predict the success of students in graduate school, but to gain information about their previous acquisition of knowledge and skill.
3. *The background information schedule.* Students were asked to complete a schedule providing a few pertinent facts about themselves and their parents. This schedule was the simplest form used in the study. Students provided the following information: (1) age, (2) sex, (3) marital status, (4) number of dependents, (5) ethnicity, (6) father's education, (7) mother's education, (8) scholarship aid, (9) previous social work experience, and (10) other work experience.

Mention should be made of other sources of data that were available but which we decided not to make use of. Letter grades of undergraduate students were available; for graduate students, however, pass/fail grades were used. This form of grading was too gross to be used in the evaluation. Few students fail graduate courses at schools of social work. Neither is the brief statement by faculty about student performance in the classroom likely to be useful in evaluating differences between students. These summaries tend to be overwhelmingly positive. Faculty generally are kind in their final assessment of students. They know that their remarks are placed on permanent record, and their written statements are extremely favorable. Few critical comments leavened the sweet rolls they served up at the end of the semester. Approximately 80 percent of the comments were favorable.

One way to control the results of an evaluation is to select measures that one has good reason to believe are insensitive to measuring real differences. We suspect that pass/fail grades and faculty evaluations of students' classroom performance are unsatisfactory measures. If we had chosen to influence the results of the study in the direction of "no differences" between accelerated and traditional students, we would have presented results based on these crude measures of student performance.

DETAILS OF THE PANEL DESIGN

The design of any evaluative study should be determined by and must be closely linked to the educational program being studied. The salient features of this comparative study of accelerated and traditional students are discussed here.

The educational program was cyclical and phased within each cycle. The program began in 1968 and was completed in 1974. The cycles, phases, and time periods are represented in Table 2-6. For Cycle I, which was used as a pretest, 6 students were admitted to the accelerated program. The number of students for Cycles II, III, and IV was respectively 14, 16, and 26. In all, there were 62 students admitted to the four cycles. Altogether, 9 accelerated students did not complete the program (see Chapter 3). Also, the 6 students in Cycle I were excluded from the study for reasons explained below. In short, a total of 47 accelerated and 61 traditional students participated in the before-and-after evaluation.

The research was linked with the phases in each cycle and a panel design was used to study the effects of the formal educational program. In fact, there were four panels in the study, one for each cycle. The panels did not begin in the same year. Neither were they of equal size. A decision was made that the panel of students in the first cycle be dealt with somewhat differently from those in later cycles.

There were only six students in the first panel. On two counts, then, these students were different from those in later cycles. These six students comprised the first group to participate in the accelerated program. As such, they were the objects of special attention from faculty members and other students. There was no practical way to disguise their identity or to prevent their special status.

In addition, the size of the first panel was small. It was only half the size of the second panel and about one-third that of the third. Thus students from the first panel were doubly different. They were the first group of stu-

TABLE 2-6
Cycles and Phases of the Accelerated Program

Cycle	*Time Period*	*Description of Phases*
I.	Fall 1967–Spring 1968	Juniors admitted to undergraduate social welfare major and complete one year of study.
	Fall 1968–Spring 1969	Seniors complete their undergraduate major in social welfare and receive the BS degree.
	Summer Session 1969	Accelerated students complete block field placement and two methods courses.
	Fall 1969–Spring 1970	Accelerated and traditional students complete the requirements for graduation and receive master's degree.
	First Year of Social Work Practice—1970–71	Graduates complete their first year of professional social work practice.
II.	Fall 1968–Spring 1969 Fall 1969–Spring 1970 Summer Session 1970 Fall 1970–Spring 1971 First Year of Social Work Practice—1971–72	Same as Above
III.	Fall 1969–Spring 1970 Fall 1970–Spring 1971 Summer Session 1971 Fall 1971–Spring 1972 First Year of Social Work Practice—1972–73	Same as Above
IV.	Fall 1970–Spring 1971 Fall 1971–Spring 1972 Summer Session 1972 Fall 1972–Spring 1973 First Year of Social Work Practice—1973–74	Same as Above

dents in the program and they were few in number at a time when their presence was most likely to evoke special attention.

These circumstances made it highly unlikely that they would be representative of those from later cycles of the program. Furthermore, it hardly seemed wise to evaluate a program in the first year of its operation. The more sensible procedure was to postpone the formal evaluation of the accelerated program for at least one year.[24] Therefore we decided to use the students from the first panel as a pretest group. The results of this group are not included in the formal evaluation. These students, however, participated in all phases of the evaluation study. Information obtained from the pretest was used to improve the format of the final evaluation.

In summary, students enrolled in the accelerated and traditional programs were examined at the start and completion of their professional education. Accelerated students were observed for the *first time* at the start of their senior year as undergraduates, and traditional students, at the start of their first year as graduate students. Both groups were observed again two years later at the point of their graduation from the school. A third and final observation was made after the students had completed one year of practice.

The measure of learning was to be the net difference between the first and second observations. Thus the effectiveness of the program would be demonstrated by the total gains made by the students minus any losses that might be registered by some. Herbert Hyman has discussed the appropriateness of this measure:

> Disputation might attend such a crucial decision on what index is most appropriate for evaluating the effectiveness of an organization. . . . Clearly, the decision made is a harsh one, for individual gains are not entered into the ledger unless they outweigh the losses. But this, it should be noted, makes the findings on effects all the more compelling. As there were net gains after deducting the losses, there would have been even more gains shown if the losses had *not* been subtracted.[25]

There was no control group in this design. We were not interested in determining the effectiveness of one educational program compared with no program. The primary consideration was to determine whether or not more learning occurred in one type of educational plan than in another. Neither was there any special need to tease out the effects resulting from repeated testing (practice effects) or outside happenings (extraneous events). It was assumed that these would be equivalent since both groups of students were equally subjected to them.

The validity of the conclusions resulting from the study were strengthened by taking into account the findings in the separate cycles. In other words, the design called for replication of the study. Two replications rather than one were called for in order to allow the experimental program to expand in size. The number of students entering the program was expected to increase if it proved successful. Therefore time was provided in the design for an evaluation of the program as it is likely to operate in the future.

Specific elements of the design appear in Table 2-7. In this representation, O stands for Observation or Measurement. The subscripts stand for the time of the first, second, and third observations or measurements. X stands for the start of the stimulus—the educational and training program; Y stands for the completion of one year of professional practice. The prime (′) differentiates the various cycles of the project.

TABLE 2-7
Simplified Design of the Comparative Evaluation

Pretest	O_1	X	O_2	Y	O_3
Final Evaluations	O_1'	X	O_2'	Y	O_3'
	O_1''	X	O_2''	Y	O_3''
	O_1'''	X	O_2'''	Y	O_3'''

The complete design for all four cycles appears in Table 2-8.

The elements of the research design have now been presented. In the next chapter the study moves ahead to consider the selection of students, certain of their background characteristics, and the careful efforts that were undertaken to obtain their cooperation in the study.

NOTES

1. Aaron Rosenblatt, "Social Constraints Affecting the Interpretation of Findings in Evaluative Studies" (An earlier version of this paper was delivered at a conference on evaluative research at the School of Social Work, University of Wisconsin, Madison, June 11–13, 1973).

2. Charles Traux and R. R. Corkhuff, *Toward Effective Counseling and Psychotherapy* (Chicago: Aldine, 1967).

3. Some information of this type was obtained from accelerated students when we interviewed them about their experience in the program (see Chapter 6). For additional material of this type see John E. Mayer and Aaron Rosenblatt, "Encounters with Danger: Social Workers in the Ghetto," *Sociology of Work and Occupations*, Vol. 2 (August 1975), pp. 227–45; and Aaron Rosenblatt and John E. Mayer, "Objectionable Supervisory Styles: The Students' View," *Social Work*, Vol. 20 (May 1975), pp. 184–89.

4. Florence Hollis, "The Implications of the Curriculum Study for Social Work," *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, Vol. 37 (1960), pp. 135–42; Ruth Smalley, "Reaction to the Curriculum Study," *Social Work*, Vol. 4 (1959), pp. 105–107; and Charlotte Towle, "Objectives for the Social Work Curriculum for the Future," *Social Service Review*, Vol. 33 (1959), pp. 362–87.

5. *Self-Study for Accreditation Review*, Vol. I (Garden City, N.Y.: Adelphi University School of Social Work, 1965).

6. Samuel Bloom, "In Evaluation of Undergraduate Psychiatric Teaching," in *Conference Proceedings* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Southern Professors of Psychiatry, 1958).

7. A useful annotated bibliography of instruments prepared by Martin Bloom is also

TABLE 2-8
Students, Phases, and Cycles for Comparative Evaluation of Accelerated and Traditional Programs

Students	Time	Time	Time
		Pretest: Cycle I	
	0_1 Sept. 1968	0_2 June 1970	0_3 June–Oct. 1971
Accelerated students (census)	Senior, Social Welfare Major	Graduation from Adelphi University School of Social Work	One year after professional employment begins
Traditional students (random sample)	Entering students Adelphi School of Social Work		
		Evaluation: Cycle II	
	$0_1'$ Sept. 1969	$0_2'$ June 1971	$0_3'$ June–Oct. 1972
Same as Above	Same as Above	Same as Above	Same as Above
		Evaluation: Cycle III	
	$0_1''$ Sept. 1970	$0_2''$ June 1972	$0_3''$ June–Oct. 1973
Same as Above	Same as Above	Same as Above	Same as Above
		Evaluation: Cycle IV	
	$0_1'''$ Sept. 1971	$0_2'''$ June 1973	$0_3'''$ June–Oct. 1974
Same as Above	Same as Above	Same as Above	Same as Above

available. See Martin Bloom, "Evaluation of Social Work Education Outcomes: A Survey of Pre-Behavioral and Post-Behavioral Solutions" (Paper presented at the Evaluation Workshop, School of Social Work, University of Wisconsin, June 11–13, 1973).

8. Aaron Rosenblatt, "A Comparison of Faculty Ratings of Student Essays," mimeographed (Garden City, N.Y.: Adelphi University School of Social Work, 1968).

9. Alfred Kadushin, "Testing the Discriminatory Capabilities of a Series of Evaluation Measures As Applied to a Program of Social Work Education," mimeographed (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin School of Social Work, 1968).

10. Thomas Walz, "The Minnesota Inventory of Social Work Knowledge," mimeographed (Minneapolis, Minn.: School of Social Work, University of Minnesota, 1972).

11. J. E. Horrocks, W. B. Horrocks, and M. E. Trayer, *A Study of Barry Black* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1960).

12. San Diego used both a 60-item and a revised and an abbreviated version of the Minnesota Inventory of Social Work Knowledge. The scores obtained from both instruments were comparable. Indeed, Weinberger notes in his final report, "For both tests the rank order of mean scores was identical." Paul Weinberger, "The Undergraduate Continuum Project: A Final Report," mimeographed (San Diego: School of Social Work, San Diego State University, 1972).

13. In all subsequent tables we shall report only whether or not the values are "not significant" (ns) or at or below the .05 level (.05).

14. We are grateful to Bertha Gronfein for having prepared these items for us.

15. Harris K. Goldstein, *Maximizing Research Learning for Three Types of Social Work Students* (Tallahassee, Fla.: Florida State University, 1972).

16. Aaron Rosenblatt, "Practitioner's Use and Evaluation of Research," *Social Work*, Vol. 13 (1968), pp. 53–59.

17. The Social Values Test was also selected for use at Madison and San Diego. See Henry J. Meyer and Donna L. McLeod, "A Study of the Values of Social Workers," in *Behavioral Science for Social Workers*, ed. Edwin Thomas (New York: Free Press, 1967).

18. Barbara K. Varley, "Social Work Values: Changes in Value Commitments of Students from Admission to MSW Graduation," *Journal of Education for Social Work*, Vol. 4 (1968), pp. 67–76.

19. Rosemary C. Sarri and Robert Vinter, *Practice Skill Assessment Instrument* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Campus Publishers, 1967).

20. Elizabeth Navarre and Rosemary C. Sarri, "Report on the Preliminary Analysis of Criteria for Assessing Student Progress in Group Work Field Instruction," mimeographed (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan School of Social Work, 1967).

21. The preponderant majority of students at Adelphi and other schools of social work specialized in what was commonly referred to as "casework" at the time this study was begun. During the three cycles, only 20 students received ratings for the groupwork items. Only the ratings for the casework items are analyzed in this report.

22. The interpretation of test results will be pursued further after all of the data from this test are presented in Chapter 4.

23. *Guide to the Use of the GRE Scores in Graduate Admissions 1971–72* (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1971).

24. "To appraise a program with any reasonable hope of accuracy we should build into the design a developmental period in which evaluation is held in abeyance until the program is established. . . . For example, the Head Start Program, which moved public education into an entirely new area, . . . was nevertheless 'evaluated' in its first summer!" See David J. Fox, "Issues in Evaluating Programs for Disadvantaged Children," *The Urban Review*, Vol. 2 (1967), pp. 6–8.

25. Herbert H. Hyman, Charles R. Wright, and Terence Hopkins, *Application of Methods of Evaluation: Four Studies of the Encampment for Citizenship* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1962).

Chapter 3

Students in the Study

by Marianne Welter

Educational experiments invariably create some disequilibrium and disruption in established academic programs. On the one hand such effects may pose a threat to the familiar and accepted way of proceeding; on the other hand they can give rise to a climate of excitement and challenge. Despite the innovative stance of the Adelphi University School of Social Work, certain disruptive effects were experienced there when the experimental program was introduced in the fall of 1968.

The coordinator of the experiment was keenly aware of these elements and of their likely impact on the students. Consequently, her primary goals were first to improve and then to stabilize their morale. Therefore she stressed the challenge resulting from participation in an important, pioneering educational adventure. This approach also was designed to serve as an antidote to students' resistance, anxieties, and self-doubts that became manifest during the initial phase of the program. This same positive stance characterized her dealings with traditional students and the fieldwork supervisors who rated both accelerated and traditional students. In short, from the outset of the project the coordinator's efforts were primarily directed toward enlisting optimum participation from both groups of students and from their supervisors. Before describing in some detail the procedures that were used to achieve this goal, a statement about the selection of the study population is in order.

SELECTION OF STUDENTS

The following procedures were developed for the selection and admission of students to the accelerated program. With some minor modifications these procedures were followed throughout the duration of the project.

During the second semester of the junior year, the coordinator described the main features of the accelerated program to all students majoring in social welfare. Those interested in the program could request individual consultation with the coordinator. These initial sessions were designed to help the students understand each successive step of the program. At the same time the coordinator explored the students' motivation, their capacity for self-investment, and their ability to participate in a program calling for intensive concentration and study. Most students who elected to explore the program more thoroughly decided to apply for admission. Only a few decided not to apply.

All applicants to the accelerated program were subjected to the same criteria and admissions procedures as applicants to the graduate school. The following criteria were established for both types of students:

1. Students were expected to have a minimal 2.5 or B− academic average. (The students' overall average clustered around a B+ score.) A few exceptions were made when there were deficits in educational opportunity or other indications suggesting that the student was capable of performing at a higher level.
2. Three references were required. Whenever the student had some prior social work experience—volunteer work, summer or part-time employment—the admissions officer recommended that at least one reference be related to this experience.
3. An autobiographical statement was required.
4. Evidence of a recent medical examination was required.

The application material was read and judged by members of the school's admissions committee. Committee members selected both types of students. They gave special emphasis to the students' motivation, maturity, and academic achievement. Faculty members who carried direct responsibility for the accelerated program were excluded from the admissions committee in order to eliminate a potential source of bias from the selection process.

With only a few exceptions, the applicants to the accelerated program met the admissions criteria and were accepted. Thus the accelerated students essentially comprised a self-selected group.

An increasing number of accelerated students were to be admitted in each of the cycles. The educational design called for 6 students to be admitted to the pretest cycle and 12 students to the second cycle. It was difficult to select 18 accelerated students for the third cycle because there were not enough candidates.

One crucial problem was financial. Aside from the general rise in costs, including tuition, accelerated students had to pay tuition and fees for a summer program at the graduate level. In addition, the students lost the chance to earn money during the summer. Such earnings often paid for part of their tuition expenses. Substantial financial assistance was needed for those students who could not afford to enter the program.

As is shown in Table 3-1, the largest increase in the number of accelerated students was projected for the fourth cycle. Eighteen students were to be admitted in the third cycle and 36 in the fourth. Because the school's plans for a new building were not realized, and along with this, a substantially enlarged overall student enrollment, the admission of 26 accelerated students seemed an optimal figure for the fourth cycle.

TABLE 3-1
Comparison of Projected and Actual Number of Accelerated Students

Cycle	*Projected*	*Actual*
II	12	14
III	18	16
IV	36	26
Total	66	56

For each cycle the traditional students who participated in the evaluation were selected from the entering graduate student population. The method of selection used was based on scientific, randomized sampling procedures. The selection took place within two weeks of the students' entrance.

Table 3-2 shows the number of the accelerated and traditional students at the start of Cycles II, III, and IV (Cycle I was the pretest[1]). There were 56 accelerated and 67 traditional students in the test group. The larger number of traditional students was intentional. It was assumed that the rate of attrition would be higher among them than among accelerated students.

TABLE 3-2
Initial Number of Accelerated and Traditional Students in the Study

Cycle	*Accelerated Students*	*Traditional Students*
II	14	16
III	16	17
IV	26	34
Total	56	67

WITHDRAWALS AND FAILURES

Accelerated Students

During Cycles II, III, and IV a total of 56 accelerated students were accepted and actually enrolled in the experimental program. Of this number, 47 (84 percent) graduated with an MS degree; 9 accelerated students (16 percent) did not complete the program. Three of the students left before the end of the first semester of graduate study. The other six students completed the undergraduate social welfare major and received their BSW degree, but did not continue with graduate study. No students left the program during either the summer internship or the final year of graduate study.

There were two main reasons for losses among accelerated students: withdrawals and failures. Six students withdrew from the program because of compelling personal circumstances. Two tragic examples were two male students who contracted cancer that was thought to be terminal. Another male student withdrew from the program when he learned that he was to be called into the armed forces.

Three other students withdrew from the program at the end of their senior year after having received their BSW degree. They felt the program made extremely heavy demands on them. Three others were counseled to leave the program because they failed to meet minimal standards of performance either in the field practice or in personal-professional maturity.

Traditional Students

A total of 67 traditional students took part in the three test cycles. Of these, 64 completed the graduate program and received an MSW degree. The three who left discontinued their education within the first graduate year. One withdrew because of combined financial and personal pressures. The other two were counseled to leave because they were failing either academically or in their practice performance, or their personality characteristics interfered with appropriate professional involvement and effectiveness.

Table 3-3 compares withdrawals, failures, and completions of both groups of students for the three test cycles.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS

Selected demographic characteristics of the two student groups were compared to establish whether or not they showed any significant differences. Ten characteristics were selected for comparison: (1) sex, (2) age, (3) marital status, (4) number of dependents, (5) ethnicity, (6) father's education, (7) mother's education, (8) scholarship aid, (9) previous social work experience, and (10) other work experience.

TABLE 3-3
Withdrawals, Failures, and Completions among Accelerated and Traditional Students

Cycle	*Withdrawals*	*Failures*	*Completions*
	Accelerated Students		
II	2	1	11
III	4	—	12
IV	—	2	24
Total	6	3	47
	Traditional Students		
II	1	—	15
III	—	—	17
IV	—	2	32
Total	1	2	64

Table 3-4 presents a comparison of the two student groups for these ten characteristics. The differences between the two groups were not statistically significant for 8 of the 10 characteristics. For age and other work experience, the differences were significant at the .05 level. Clearly, the accelerated students were younger. For that reason they probably had less opportunity to acquire other kinds of work experience. The accelerated students also had less previous social work experience. Here, however, the differences were not statistically significant at the .05 level. In short, the two groups of students appeared to be similar to each other in all respects except those related to age.

Having identified the students in the study, let us now turn to the problem of obtaining their willingness to participate in the evaluation.

SUSTAINING COOPERATION DURING THE STUDY

One crucial aspect of the project was the collection of the research data. A research investigation only can be as valid as the evidence on which it is based. Thus the cooperation of students and supervisors in the testing procedures was of paramount importance and calls for special recognition. The students were asked to participate in an extensive series of before-and-after tests. Also, their supervisors were asked to provide extensive data on the students' practice performance at three points in time.

Students who entered the accelerated program were informed that the research component was an integral part of the educational project. By and large they accepted the testing requirements and procedures without reservation. In contrast, those traditional students selected on a random basis from the total graduate student population were much less accepting

TABLE 3-4
Selected Demographic Characteristics of Accelerated and Traditional Students

Types of Characteristics	Accelerated Students		Traditional Students		Chi-Square and Level of Probability
	N	%	N	%	
Sex					
Male	9	19	23	38	3.54
Female	38	81	38	62	ns
Age					
Less than 23	15	32	4	7	10.26
23–28 years	9	19	22	36	<.05
29+	23	49	35	57	
Marital Status					
Single	19	40	22	36	0.21
Married	23	49	32	52	ns
Separated, Widowed, Divorced	5	11	7	12	
Number of Dependents[a]					
None	25	54[b]	33	54	0.92
One	7	15	7	11	ns
Two	7	15	12	20	
Three or more	7	15	9	15	
Ethnicity					
White	40	85	52	85	0.06
Nonwhite	7	15	9	15	ns
Father's Education[a]					
0–9	10	22	18	30	0.02
10–11	7	15	13	21	ns
12	12	26	12	19	
12+	17	37	18	30	
Mother's Education					
0–9	11	23	14	23	0.02
10–11	7	15	10	16	ns
12	22	47	21	34	
12+	7	15	16	27	
Scholarship Aid					
Yes	21	45	33	54	0.60
No	26	55	28	46	ns
Previous Social Work Experience					
Less than 1 year	27	57	21	34	2.73
One year or more	20	43	40	66	ns

Types of Characteristics	Accelerated Students		Traditional Students		Chi-Square and Level of Probability
	N	%	N	%	
Other Work Experience					
Less than 3 years	13	28	31	51	3.99
Three years or more	34	72	30	49	<.05

NOTE: Table includes only those students who participated in all phases of the research program.

[a] Total accelerated responses equal 46 because one student failed to answer the question.

[b] Difference in this category due to rounding off.

of the 6½ hours of testing. Many of them disliked the tests. Both groups particularly disliked the three-hour Graduate Record Examination.

Supervisors used the Practice Skill Assessment Instrument (PSAI) to rate students' fieldwork performance. Before they administered the PSAI the supervisors attended an orientation meeting, which was usually held at the school. The purpose of the orientation was to explain all facets of the instrument and to ensure its uniform application. Generally it took the supervisors 1½–2 hours to complete the PSAI form.

Participation in the research required a substantial investment of time and effort from students and supervisors. The "before" series of tests had to be administered within the first few weeks after the traditional students had entered graduate school. Consequently, they had little time to build up a sense of participating in a significant educational experiment. Also, the "after" tests were repeated two years later, close to graduation and final separation when the students were thinking about completing their school responsibilities and planning their future careers.

The "one year after" collection of data called for certain differences in approach, strategy, and execution. The investigators were acutely aware that there might be considerable attrition among students, especially when they were called upon to participate in two extensive testings with long time lapses between each test series.

A decision was made to invest a considerable amount of time and effort in securing and retaining the students' cooperation. The wisdom of this decision was affirmed when the investigators subsequently learned about the lack of student cooperation encountered at San Diego and Madison, where similar experimental projects were being conducted. For example, Paul Weinberger noted in the final report on the Undergraduate Continuum Project at the San Diego School of Social Work that "because of the low questionnaire return rate, the original design could not be followed and students in the two years who differed in extent of work experience were combined when data analysis was done." He also stated that "difficulties in obtaining cooperation from MSW students whose help was solicited on numerous occasions, necessitated dispensing with the original study design."[2]

Alfred Kadushin, director of the Experimental Program at the School of Social Work, University of Wisconsin–Madison, also encountered difficulties in maintaining student cooperation. After describing some of the steps taken in order to enhance the students' motivation to participate in the research tests, he reported that "despite this preparation only 29 students of the total graduating group of 85 showed up on the scheduled date." Because of the low turnout a second date was arranged, preceded by the same preparatory procedures. "On this second try we attained the cooperation of an additional 16 students (amounting to 45 out of a total of 85). . . .The same reluctance to participation was evidenced with regard to other evaluation procedures not given on a group basis."[3]

For example, the Wisconsin study entailed a

> typescript of a tape recording of an interview conducted by the student which he (the student) regarded as representative of his work.
>
> Solicitation of this data was made only to those students enrolled in the experimental program: Thirteen 3-2 students and 23 matched control 4-2 students. The student who submitted an interview was paid $50.00. Those received detailed instructions and had some four months before the material was due. Despite these incentives, only 15 of the total of 36 solicited, submitted an interview transcript.[4]

Since the success of the investigation depended on optimal participation of both student groups, a major effort was made through group and individual meetings with students, and through letters and telephone calls, to kindle, sustain, and reinforce their cooperation. The coordinator sought to instill in them a sense of the significant contribution they were making to Adelphi in particular and to professional social work education in general. For both student groups in each of the three cycles the same procedures were followed. Since the investigators were successful in securing the cooperation of students, the procedures that they followed are set down in some detail.

> Each traditional student included in the sample received a personal letter in which the nature and purpose of the experimental project was explained, as well as the student's random selection as a participant in the research investigation. In addition, several alternative dates were suggested for a meeting to be held for the purpose of further interpreting the project. Also stated in the letter was the need to determine a generally accepted time for taking the first test series. The accelerated student groups, who were already familiar with the project, received a different type of letter. It welcomed them into the program and informed them of plans for the initial meeting.
>
> Both groups of students attended the orientation meetings. In most instances, two meetings had to be arranged to enable all students to take part. In exceptional cases, students were seen individually. Participation in these meetings was of pivotal importance. They provided the coordinator with a major opportunity to generate a genuine

> interest in the educational experiment. Other goals were also set for these meetings. Students received positive recognition of their vital role as 'providers' of research data; and most important, the coordinator sought to establish in them a firm sense of commitment to participating in both of the test series.
>
> A similar set of procedures was followed as graduation approached and the second day of testing neared. Again the main specific steps included sending the students letters to attend a meeting; making numerous personal and telephone contacts; and being present at the actual test-taking sessions. To recapture the students' interest in the research at this late hour called for the same skills that had been effectively used at the earlier meetings.

A total of 64 traditional students completed the graduate program and earned their MSW degree. Table 3-5 shows the number who completed the before-and-after tests. Only 3 of 64 traditional students, or 5 percent, failed to continue in the research investigation. In all, only 3 of the 111 students in the study who completed the MSW program dropped out of the research investigation. This represented a high degree of student cooperation. This becomes even more noteworthy when it is recalled that the study took place during the general climate of student unrest that pervaded the campus in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

TABLE 3-5
Test Attrition Among Students

Cycle	*Accelerated Students at Time 1*	*Test Attrition*	*% Attrition*	*Traditional Students at Time 1*	*Test Attrition*	*% Attrition*
II	11	0	0	15	1	7
III	12	0	0	17	1	6
IV	24	0	0	32	1[a]	3
Total	47	0	0	64	3	5

[a] This student received a research assistantship during the second year of his graduate program and was given a research assignment that included working with the test instruments used in the experimental project. For this reason he had to be excluded from the "after" test series.

The supervisors evaluated the students' performance in field practice by making use of the Practice Skill Assessment Instrument. To obtain each supervisor's cooperation was as important as securing the continued cooperation of the students. Similar procedures were used to accomplish this objective as were used with students. Two meetings with supervisors consisted of two main parts: the first was devoted to summarizing the key features of the experimental program with particular focus on research objectives and design; the second centered around a thorough explanation of the PSAI. Sufficient time was allowed for the supervisors to examine the instrument and to raise questions about all aspects of it.

Each student had three different supervisors who participated in the research. The educational design required that each student have a different practice experience and hence a different supervisor each year. Thus every student had one supervisor at the "before" phase and a different supervisor at the "after" phase. At the one-year-after follow-up phase still another set of supervisors rated students' performance.

A total of 71 supervisors carried responsibility for the field practice learning throughout the three cycles. Of these, 22 supervised more than one student. The number of students ranged from two to six, with an average of about three per supervisor. Thus a sizable group of supervisors was asked to multiply their investment by completing the PSAI several times over. Their full and generous cooperation was a highly valued contribution to the evaluation, to the educational experiment itself, and to the Adelphi School of Social Work.

In summary, this chapter contains information on the way that students were selected for the study. There were no significant differences between the two groups for the characteristics examined, with two exceptions: accelerated students were younger and had less work experience. Considerable effort was expended in securing the cooperation of the students and their supervisors. The investigators were generally successful in this regard. Let us now examine the data obtained from the students and their supervisors.

NOTES

1. The six students enrolled in Cycle I were eliminated from the statistical analysis, in accordance with the research design.

2. Paul Weinberger, "The Undergraduate Continuum Project: A Final Report," mimeographed (San Diego: School of Social Work, San Diego State University, 1972).

3. Alfred Kadushin and George Kelling, "Final Report: An Innovative Program in Social Work Education, the 3-2 Program," mimeographed (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin School of Social Work, 1973).

4. *Ibid.*

Chapter 4

Changes in Students' Knowledge, Values, and Skill

by Aaron Rosenblatt

The evaluation of accelerated social work education conducted at the Adelphi University School of Social Work was designed to answer three questions:

1. Did accelerated and traditional students differ in the amount of formal learning they acquired during their training?
2. Did accelerated and traditional students differ in their practice one year after graduation?
3. Were there differences in the educational background of students enrolled in the accelerated program?

Most of the resources in this study were expended in answering the first question. Data bearing on this question are presented in this chapter. Data pertaining to the second and third questions are presented in the following chapter.

Let us recall briefly certain important features of the research design. It called for a before-and-after study of accelerated and traditional students. In this way we were able to compare changes that occurred in these two groups. Change scores or learning scores were obtained from each cycle and for all three cycles combined. To obtain these we subtracted the mean score at the start of the study from the mean score at the end of the study. The difference in means was compared for accelerated and traditional students.

The t-test values resulting from the difference in scores appear in the right-hand column of the 84 individual tables that are located in the Appendix. The values in this column and the levels of statistical significance constituted the core findings of this study. The t-test values permitted us to determine whether or not the difference in learning between accelerated and traditional students was statistically significant. (The t-test values preceded by a negative sign indicate that more learning occurred among traditional students.)

Some additional data presented in this chapter may be of special interest to social work educators and practitioners. The scores of accelerated and traditional students are presented both at the start and at the completion of their social work education. Tests of significance were computed in order to show whether or not the differences between these scores were statistically significant either at the start or at the completion of their social work education.

A large mass of data was generated in the course of completing this study. Witness the 84 tables in the Appendix, each of which contains 12 divisions. We have given considerable thought to the best form of presenting these data. The problem is not easily solved. Someone once compared the making of statistical tables to the making of sausages. Once the machinery is set up, the tables, like sausages, can roll out endlessly. The content or the stuffing can vary; nonetheless, they all come out looking alike. Consequently even the most ardent sausage lover soon loses his appetite.

It would have been possible, of course, to present all 84 tables in the body of the text. This seemed to be too much to ask of any reader. Tables that are cast in the same form make for dull reading. Even the specialist is certain to become bored. Yet a research report is not an entertainment. And it is obvious that we cannot write as well as Graham Green.

We worried the problem for some time and made several false starts. Finally we arrived at the following format: we prepared 9 summary tables that appear at appropriate points in the text of this chapter. They are based on the findings contained in the 84 individual tables in the Appendix. The description and discussion of the findings in the text are based primarily on the information contained in the summary tables. There is a certain irony here: in order to simplify the presentation we had to prepare 9 additional tables!

The summary tables include information for each of the three cycles and for Cycles II–IV combined. The summary tables also contain data on trends and differences in knowledge, values, and skill. This simplified plan has only partially solved the problem. Reading this chapter will still make considerable demands upon the patience of the reader.

FOUNDATION KNOWLEDGE: INVENTORY OF SOCIAL WORK KNOWLEDGE

The data in Table 4-A summarize findings that appear in Tables 4-l through 4-7 obtained from the Inventory of Social Work Knowledge. The inventory is divided into six sections, which combined with the three cycles resulted in 18 comparisons between accelerated and traditional students. The comparisons in Table 4-A provide two kinds of information: which group of students learned more during the study; and whether or not this difference in learning was statistically significant.

For 8 of the comparisons the mean learning scores of traditional students were higher. In other words, the traditional students showed greater increment of knowledge on these comparisons. For 10 of the comparisons the mean learning scores of accelerated students were higher. The mean learning scores of traditional students were higher for all three cycles in History and Philosophy, and Social Policies and Issues. For the other four sections the scores of accelerated students were generally higher. Only 4 of the 18 differences reached the .05 level of statistical significance. All of these showed that the accelerated students learned significantly more than did the traditional students.

When Cycles II–IV were combined, the learning scores of accelerated students were higher for four of the six comparisons. The differences in learning scores for three of the six sections reached the .05 level of statistical significance. The learning scores of traditional students were significantly higher for the History and Philosophy section. The learning of accelerated students was significantly higher for the Fields of Social Work and the Practice of Social Work.

When the sections of the Inventory of Social Work Knowledge were combined, the learning of the accelerated students was higher for Cycles II and IV. For both of these cycles, the differences were statistically significant. In addition, when the scores of the combined test and the combined cycles were compared, the overall learning score of accelerated students was both higher and statistically significant.

The changes that occurred during the study period can be summarized as follows: accelerated students possessed less knowledge at the start of their education and generally they learned more. When the cycles and the sections of the inventory were combined, the difference in learning between accelerated and traditional students was statistically significant.

BARRY BLACK TEST

The data in Table 4-B summarize the findings that appear in Tables 4-8 through 4-12. The Barry Black Test is divided into two parts: the first comprises the standard form of the test and the second comprises the supplementary questions designed to reflect the Adelphi curriculum.

TABLE 4-A
Summary of Change in Learning Scores for Inventory of Social Work Knowledge

	History & Philosophy	*Social Policies & Issues*	*Social Security & Social Welfare*	*Fields of Social Work*	*Profession of Social Work*	*Practice of Social Work*	*Total Test*
Cycle II							
Greater Learning	Traditional	Traditional	Accelerated	Accelerated	Accelerated	Accelerated	Accelerated
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	<.05	<.05
Cycle III							
Greater Learning	Traditional	Traditional	Traditional	Accelerated	Accelerated	Traditional	Traditional
Level of Signficance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycle IV							
Greater Learning	Traditional	Traditional	Accelerated	Accelerated	Accelerated	Accelerated	Accelerated
Level of Significance	ns	ns	<.05	<.05	ns	<.05	<.05
Cycles II–IV Combined							
Greater Learning	Traditional	Traditional	Accelerated	Accelerated	Accelerated	Accelerated	Accelerated
Level of Significance	<.05	ns	ns	<.05	ns	<.05	<.05

TABLE 4-B
Summary of Change in Learning Scores for a Study of Barry Black

	Diagnostic Section	*Treatment Section*	*Total Test (Standard Form)*	*Supplementary Items*	
				Specific	*General*
Cycle II					
Greater Learning	Traditional	Accelerated	Traditional	Accelerated	Accelerated
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycle III					
Greater Learning	Accelerated	Accelerated	Accelerated	Traditional	Traditional
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycle IV					
Greater Learning	Traditional	Traditional	Traditional	Traditional	Accelerated
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycles II–IV Combined					
Greater Learning	Traditional	Accelerated	Traditional	Traditional	Accelerated
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns

The standard form is divided into two sections—Diagnostic and Treatment. Thus the two sections of the standard form and the three cycles permitted six comparisons in learning between accelerated and traditional students. None of these differences was statistically significant. For three of the comparisons the accelerated students showed more learning, and for the remaining three the traditional students showed more learning. When the diagnostic and treatment learning were combined, there were no statistically significant differences. For two of the three cycles the learning scores of the traditional students were higher.

The two sections of the Barry Black supplementary items showed a pattern that was quite similar to that resulting from the standard form. Of the six comparisons in learning none of the differences was statistically significant. Furthermore, there was no discernible trend favoring either accelerated or traditional students. Each group had higher learning scores for three comparisons.

When the cycles were combined, there were no significant differences in learning. The scores of accelerated students were slightly higher on the treatment and general Adelphi items. The traditional students showed higher learning scores on the diagnostic and specific Adelphi items. In addition, learning scores of traditional students were slightly higher for the total Barry Black Test.

There was a slight trend for the absolute scores of accelerated students to be higher at the start and at the completion of training on the standard form of the Barry Black Test. However the absolute scores of traditional students were higher on the supplementary items (see Tables 4-8 through 4-12 in the Appendix).

In summary, there were no statistically significant differences in the learning scores of accelerated and traditional students. Also, there was no consistent overall trend in favor of either group as evidenced by their scores on the Barry Black Test.

MEASUREMENT OF ATTITUDES AND RESEARCH KNOWLEDGE

Table 4-C deals with changes in research attitudes and research knowledge as devised by Harris Goldstein. This instrument is divided into three parts: attitudes, attitudes and knowledge, and knowledge. The three parts are then added together to yield a total score. A summary of the test results appears in the table.

Differences in learning were quite small between accelerated and traditional students for each of the three cycles. None of the differences was statistically significant at the .05 level and there was no overall trend favoring either group of students. The three sections of the test and the three cycles made possible nine comparisons in learning. For four of the nine, the accelerated students showed slightly higher learning scores, and for

TABLE 4-C
Summary of Change in Learning Scores for the Measurement of Attitudes and Research Knowledge

	Attitudes	*Attitudes & Knowledge*	*Knowledge*	*Total Test*
Cycle II				
Greater Change	Traditional	Accelerated	Accelerated	Accelerated
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycle III				
Greater Change	Traditional	Traditional	Traditional	Traditional
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycle IV				
Greater Change	Accelerated	Accelerated	Traditional	Accelerated
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycles II–IV Combined				
Greater Change	Accelerated	Accelerated	Traditional	Accelerated
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns

the remaining five, the traditional students were slightly higher.

The scores for the total test revealed essentially the same pattern. For each of the three cycles there was no statistically significant difference between accelerated and traditional students. The learning scores of accelerated students were higher for two cycles. When the three cycles were combined and the learning scores for each part of the test examined, there was no significant difference between accelerated and traditional students.

The results that appear in Tables 4-13 through 4-16 may be somewhat discouraging to researchers. From the start to the completion of their education the learning scores of both accelerated and traditional students regressed slightly for the first two sections of the test. Accelerated students showed less and traditional students showed more regression on these sections. Most of the positive change occurred in the third part of the test dealing with knowledge. There, traditional students registered slightly more learning than accelerated students.

The combined learning scores for the three parts and for the three cycles showed no statistically significant difference between accelerated and traditional students. In short, the differences between accelerated and traditional students did not reach statistical significance for any of the cycles, for any of the parts of the test, or for any of the combinations of cycles and parts examined.

SOCIAL WORK VALUES TEST

The Social Work Values Test was the only one of the instruments that failed to show a statistically significant difference in a positive direction between the scores of all students from the start to the end of their education and training.[1] Before presenting the findings we will speculate on the reasons for this lack of change in values. One factor may have resulted from the self-selection of students who enter the profession of social work. The Social Work Values Test apparently is able to discriminate between the values of teachers and social workers.[2] However it may not be able to discriminate between first-year and second-year social work students.[3] This may result from the value commitment already made by students; that is, students entering the profession may have already developed values that are quite similar to those of second-year students.

Another possible factor worth noting is the "ceiling effect." The results of the test showed that the absolute scores of both first-year graduate students and undergraduate social welfare majors were extremely high at Adelphi. There are four items for each dimension of the test. Scores of "definitely agree" are rated 4 and "probably agree" are rated 3, and so forth. The scores for each dimension may range from a low of 4 to a high of 16. The overall mean score of accelerated students was 13.2 for each dimension at the start of their education. The overall score of the traditional students of 12.8 was also high. In other words, a ceiling effect probably was in operation. At the start of training the scores of students were at such a high level that there was comparatively little room for improvement.

These high scores also seemed to offer some evidence for the previous point—that students acquired the desired values *before* they entered the professional school. Faculty at schools of social work may wish to ponder the meaning of these high scores when developing curriculum goals.

Another possible explanation of the low change in social work values requires further exploration. Students' values may be affected adversely as well as positively by their education and training. On the one hand, the values of certain students may be strengthened as a result of their schooling; on the other hand, some students may become somewhat jaded as they witness or are party to certain practices in social work of which they do not approve. This kind of "practice shock" is common among those training for the professions. It occurs in both education and medicine when students enter the classroom and the hospital ward. The net effect may be that the changes in different directions cancel out each other. Thus there may have been considerable "turnover" in values that did not appear in the summary measure reported in the tables.

The results of the Social Work Values Test appear in Tables 4-17 through 4-27 in the Appendix. Tables 4-D and 4-E contain a summary of the results. There are 10 dimensions of the test and three cycles, thus there were 30 comparisons made between accelerated and traditional students regarding changes in their values. None of these comparisons resulted in a difference of statistical significance. Generally, there was little positive change in values. For some dimensions there was a slight decline in a social work value. Indeed for 3 of the 10 comparisons there was a decrease in the learning scores of both accelerated and traditional students from the start to the completion of their education.

When all of the dimensions were combined into one learning score for each cycle, the differences were not statistically significant. For Cycle II, accelerated students showed more positive change than did traditional students. For Cycle III, the social work values of both accelerated and traditional students showed some regression. Those of accelerated students were slightly greater than those of traditional students. For Cycle IV, accelerated students once again showed a regression in social work values while traditional students showed a very modest positive change.

The total score for Cycles II–IV combined showed that accelerated students started their education with higher values than did traditional students (see Table 4-27). This overall difference was statistically significant at the .05 level. The values of accelerated students declined slightly while those of traditional students increased modestly by the end of their education. At that point, however, accelerated students still possessed slightly higher values than did traditional students, but the difference was no

TABLE 4-D
Summary of Change in Values for the Social Work Values Test (Part I: Values 1–5)

	Public Aid vs. Private Effort	*Personal Freedom vs. Societal Control*	*Personal Goals vs. Maintenance of Group*	*Social Causation vs. Individual Autonomy*	*Pluralism vs. Homogeneity*
Cycle II					
Greater Change	Traditional	Traditional	Accelerated	Traditional	Traditional
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycle III					
Greater Change	Accelerated	Traditional	Accelerated	Accelerated	Traditional
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycle IV					
Greater Change	Traditional	Traditional	Accelerated	Traditional	Traditional
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycles II–IV Combined					
Greater Change	Traditional	Traditional	Accelerated	Traditional	Traditional
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns

TABLE 4-E
Summary of Change in Values for the Social Work Values Test (Part II: Values 6–10)

	Secularism vs. Religiosity	*Self-Determinism vs. Fatalism*	*Positive Satisfaction vs. Struggle-Denial*	*Social Protection vs. Social Retribution*	*Innovation-Change vs. Traditionalism*	*Total Score*
Cycle II						
Greater Change	Accelerated	Accelerated	Accelerated	Traditional	Accelerated	Accelerated
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycle III						
Greater Change	Traditional	Accelerated	Traditional	Traditional	Traditional	Traditional
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycle IV						
Greater Change	Traditional	Traditional	Traditional	Traditional	Traditional	Traditional
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycles II–IV Combined						
Greater Change	Accelerated	Accelerated	Accelerated	Traditional	Traditional	Traditional
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns

longer statistically significant. The decline in values among accelerated students was modest, as was the gain of traditional students. Thus their values became more alike by the end of training and the differences between them at that point were no longer statistically significant.

In summary, we have speculated about but do not know why the values of social work students did not show change in the expected direction on the Social Work Values Test. Traditional students showed very modest gains in values, and accelerated students, very modest losses. Comparisons of change in values for each of the three cycles and for all of the cycles combined showed no statistical difference in the values of either group.

PRACTICE SKILL ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

The Practice Skill Assessment Instrument (PSAI) is divided into five sections: community, agency, student, client, and casework. Supervisors rated students' skills at the start and at the end of the study period. Unlike the instruments measuring foundation knowledge and values, the PSAI does not have any one summary measure for all 57 items. This only can be obtained by averaging all of the scores. Later we will make limited use of such a measure. Our primary unit of discussion is each section of the PSAI, and changes in practice skill are discussed for each of the five. A brief overview, which appears below, may be helpful before discussing the findings in greater detail.

The practice ratings for both accelerated and traditional students showed positive change in all items from the start to the end of their training. Generally, more improvement was shown in the ratings of accelerated students. For individual items in each cycle these differences were rarely statistically significant. When the cycles were combined and the number of students much larger, the differences in improvement were more likely to be statistically significant.

At the start of training the ratings of traditional students were generally higher than those of accelerated students. As a summary measure, we computed an average of the average ratings. At the start of training it was 4.95 for traditional and 4.05 for accelerated students, a sizable difference. Furthermore, in 35 of 57 comparisons for Cycles II, III, and IV combined, the difference was statistically significant at the .05 level. Thus accelerated students started fieldwork at a decidedly lower level than did traditional students.

By the end of training the findings were quite different. By then accelerated students had caught up with traditional students. Indeed, on some items they had surpassed them. At the end of training, for the combined cycles the average of the averages was 6.97 for traditional students and 6.95 for accelerated students. The average difference for each item had decreased to only .02. The ratings of traditional students were higher on 27 of the 57 items. On 19 items, accelerated students had higher ratings. (We classified 11 differences as ties, since the means were .05 or less apart from each other.) In only 2 of the 57 items was the difference in ratings statistically significant. On one item the rating of traditional students was higher, on the other, the rating of accelerated students was higher.

What happened was obvious. Both accelerated and traditional students improved their ratings. Accelerated students, however, showed much more improvement. This was true for all 57 items. Furthermore, on 24 items when the cycles were combined, the change in ratings was statistically significant at the .05 level.

In the five summaries presented below, we shall report the findings for each of the three cycles.

Community Items

The ratings for the three cycles and four community items of the PSAI yielded 12 comparisons between the change scores of accelerated and traditional students. Table 4-F shows that accelerated students registered greater positive change for all 12 comparisons, with two of the differences statistically significant at the .05 level. When the cycles were combined, accelerated students showed greater positive change for all four comparisons, three of which were statistically significant.

At the start of training, traditional students received higher ratings on all of the items for each of the cycles (see Tables 4-28 through 4-31). At the completion of training, the ratings of accelerated students were higher on 7 of the 12 comparisons. The greater improvement by the accelerated students permitted them to close the gap between themselves and traditional students.

In short, by the end of the study the accelerated students showed greater improvement on all items for all cycles. These improvements had the effect of cancelling out initial differences that had existed between the two groups.

Agency Items

Items 5–11 deal with the fieldwork agency. Table 4-G contains a summary of changes in the ratings of these items. The three cycles and seven agency items of the PSAI resulted in 21 comparisons between the change scores of accelerated and traditional students. For 17 of the 21, the accelerated students showed greater positive change than did the traditional students, with the differences for Items 7 and 8 statistically significant.

When the three cycles were combined, there were 7 comparisons between the change scores of the two groups. For each of the 7, the accelerated students showed greater positive change, with Items 7 and 8 again statistically significant.

TABLE 4-F
Summary of Change in Practice Skill for Community Items (1–4)

	Item 1	*Item 2*	*Item 3*	*Item 4*
Cycle II				
Greater Change	Accelerated	Accelerated	Accelerated	Accelerated
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycle III				
Greater Change	Accelerated	Accelerated	Accelerated	Accelerated
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycle IV				
Greater Change	Accelerated	Accelerated	Accelerated	Accelerated
Level of Significance	<.05	ns	<.05	ns
Cycles II–IV Combined				
Greater Change	Accelerated	Accelerated	Accelerated	Accelerated
Level of Significance	<.05	ns	<.05	<.05

TABLE 4-G
Summary of Change in Practice Skill for Agency Items (5–11)

	Item 5	*Item 6*	*Item 7*	*Item 8*	*Item 9*	*Item 10*	*Item 11*
Cycle II							
Greater Change	Trad.	Trad.	Accel.	Accel.	Trad.	Accel.	Trad.
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycle III							
Greater Change	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycle IV							
Greater Change	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.
Level of Significance	ns	ns	<.05	<.05	ns	ns	ns
Cycles II–IV Combined							
Greater Change	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.
Level of Significance	ns	ns	<.05	<.05	ns	ns	ns

At the start of the study, the ratings of traditional students were higher on 19 of 21 comparisons, only 3 of which were statistically significant (see Tables 4-32 through 4-38). By the completion of the study, differences in the ratings of accelerated and traditional students were minor. Only the difference for Item 8 was statistically significant, where the rating of accelerated students was higher (see Table 4-35). Thus the ratings of accelerated students showed marked improvement on the agency items. For all three cycles combined all of the change ratings were higher for accelerated students.

In short, accelerated students consistently showed greater improvement on agency items than did traditional students. Generally, a comparison of improvement in ratings for both groups on each of the three cycles was not statistically significant. When the cycles were combined, on 2 of the 7 items the differences in improvement were statistically significant. Clearly, by the end of training there was little difference of any consequence on the agency items between accelerated and traditional students.

Student Items

Items 12–20 deal with the performance ratings of students in fieldwork. The summary of findings for these items appears in Table 4-H. The nine student items of the PSAI for each of the three cycles yielded a total of 27 comparisons in the amount of change shown by accelerated and traditional students during the training period. For 23 of the 27 comparisons the accelerated students showed greater increments in skill ratings than did the traditional students. None of these differences was statistically significant.

Only when the cycles were combined did three of the comparisons reach the .05 level of statistical significance. In each instance the improvement in ratings of accelerated students was larger.

At the start of the study for the combined cycles, traditional students received higher ratings for seven of the nine items at the .05 level of statistical significance (see Tables 4-39 through 4-47). Initially their skill in these fieldwork items was judged as superior to that of accelerated students. At the end of the study, the ratings of traditional students were still higher on eight of the nine items. The differences in the ratings for all nine items, however, were no longer statistically significant.

In short, the findings of Items 12–20 showed a distinct trend. Accelerated students improved more than did traditional students in each of the cycles. Accelerated students, however, started from a decidedly lower base. By the end of their education there was no statistically significant difference between the groups although the ratings of traditional students tended to be higher on eight of nine items.

TABLE 4-H
Summary of Change in Practice Skill for Student Items (12–20)

	Item 12	*Item 13*	*Item 14*	*Item 15*	*Item 16*	*Item 17*	*Item 18*	*Item 19*	*Item 20*
Cycle II									
Greater Change	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Trad.
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycle III									
Greater Change	Accel.	Trad.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycle IV									
Greater Change	Trad.	Accel.	Accel.	Trad.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycles II–IV Combined									
Greater Change	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.
Level of Significance	ns	ns	<.05	ns	ns	<.05	<.05	ns	ns

Client Items

Items 21–38 deal with client items. The summary of the results for these items appears in Tables 4-I and 4-J. For the 18 client items, a total of 52 comparisons were possible regarding differences in ratings from the start to the end of training for accelerated and traditional students.[4]

Of the 52 comparisons, 49 showed higher increments in the ratings of accelerated students. Of the 49 higher ratings, only 4 were statistically significant at the .05 level. Clearly there was a strong trend for the ratings of accelerated students to show greater increments than for traditional students. In most instances, however, the differences were not statistically significant.

When the cycles were combined, accelerated students showed greater increments on all 18 items, and 8 of these were statistically significant at the .05 level. At the start of training, the combined ratings of the cycles were higher for traditional students on all 18 comparisons, 14 of which were statistically significant. (See Tables 4-48 through 4-65.) The ratings of accelerated students increased more than did those of traditional students. Thus by the end of the training period the ratings of traditional students were higher on 11 items, only 1 of which was statistically significant. For the other 7 items, the ratings of accelerated students were higher.

Casework Items

Items 39–57 dealing with casework complete those PSAI items used in this study. The 19 casework items for the three cycles resulted in 55 comparisons between accelerated and traditional students.[5] The summary of the casework items appears in Tables 4-K and 4-L.

For 51 of the 55 comparisons the change scores of accelerated students were higher. Only two of the differences were statistically significant at the .05 level. For both of these, Items 39 and 44 in Cycle IV, the improvement of accelerated students was higher than that of traditional students.

When Cycles II–IV were combined, the improvement in the ratings of accelerated students was higher on all 19 comparisons, 7 of which reached the .05 level of statistical significance.

At the start of the study, for each of the 19 items the ratings of traditional students for Cycles II–IV combined were always higher than those of accelerated students (see Tables 4-66 through 4-84). On 7 of these 19 items, the differences between them were statistically significant at the start of training. By the end of the training period, the differences between accelerated and traditional students were no longer statistically significant. For 11 of the 19 comparisons at the end of training, the ratings of accelerated students were slightly higher.

TABLE 4-I
Summary of Change in Practice Skill for Client Items (21–29)

	Item 21	*Item 22*	*Item 23*	*Item 24*	*Item 25*	*Item 26*	*Item 27*	*Item 28*	*Item 29*
Cycle II									
Greater Change	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.
Level of Significance	ns	ns	<.05	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycle III									
Greater Change	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.
Level of Significance	ns	<.05	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycle IV									
Greater Change	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Trad.	Accel.	Trad.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycles II–IV Combined									
Greater Change	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.
Level of Significance	<.05	<.05	ns	ns	ns	ns	<.05	<.05	ns

TABLE 4-J
Summary of Change in Practice Skill for Client Items (30–38)

	Item 30	*Item 31*	*Item 32*	*Item 33*	*Item 34*	*Item 35*	*Item 36*	*Item 37*	*Item 38*
Cycle II									
Greater Change	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	—	Trad.	Accel.	Accel.
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	—	ns	ns	ns
Cycle III									
Greater Change	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	—	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.
Level of Significance	<.05	<.05	ns	ns	ns	—	ns	ns	ns
Cycle IV									
Greater Change	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycles II–IV Combined									
Greater Change	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.
Level of Significance	<.05	<.05	<.05	ns	ns	ns	ns	<.05	ns

TABLE 4-K
Summary of Change in Practice Skill for Casework Items (39–47)

	Item 39	*Item 40*	*Item 41*	*Item 42*	*Item 43*	*Item 44*	*Item 45*	*Item 46*	*Item 47*
Cycle II									
Greater Change	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycle III									
Greater Change	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel	Accel.
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycle IV									
Greater Change	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.
Level of Significance	<.05	ns	ns	ns	ns	<.05	ns	ns	ns
Cycles II–IV Combined									
Greater Change	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.
Level of Significance	<.05	<.05	<.05	ns	<.05	<.05	<.05	ns	<.05

TABLE 4-L
Summary of Change in Practice Skill for Casework Items (48–57)

	Item 48	*Item 49*	*Item 50*	*Item 51*	*Item 52*	*Item 53*	*Item 54*	*Item 55*	*Item 56*	*Item 57*
Cycle II										
Greater Change	Trad.	Trad.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	—	—	Accel.
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	—	—	ns
Cycle III										
Greater Change	Accel.	Trad.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Trad.	Accel.	Accel.
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycle IV										
Greater Change	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Cycles II–IV Combined										
Greater Change	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.	Accel.
Level of Significance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns

Once again the same pattern already noted in the preceding tables occurred. For each of the cycles the accelerated students received lower ratings at the start of training. During the course of fieldwork training their casework ratings rose more than those of traditional students. Consequently the differences between both groups were negligible by the end of training.

In summary, this chapter contains data on changes in the students' foundation knowledge, values, knowledge of practice, and practice skills. These findings based on before-and-after measures constituted the core of the evaluation. The next chapter deals with two other kinds of data—the educational background of students and their practice skill one year after graduation.

NOTES

1. Therefore the results of this test will not be used in evaluating the effect of accelerated education. The findings are presented because of their general interest to social workers.

2. Henry J. Meyer and Donna L. McLeod, "A Study of the Values of Social Workers," in *Behavioral Science for Social Workers*, ed. Edwin Thomas (New York: Free Press, 1967).

3. Alfred Kadushin, "Testing the Discriminatory Capabilities of a Series of Evaluation Measures As Applied to a Program of Social Work Education," mimeographed (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin School of Social Work, 1968).

4. Comparisons for Cycles II and III of Item 35 were not possible. This item deals with the students' preparation of the client for termination. Because the ratings were made so soon after the start of fieldwork, it was not possible to rate six or more students. Findings based on less than six students were not reported in this study. Thus only 52 comparisons were reported.

5. Two comparisons had less than six subjects, so that these findings were not reported.

Chapter 5

Educational Background and Practice Skill One Year After Graduation

by Aaron Rosenblatt

Some faculty voiced serious doubts about the value of accelerated programs even before any of them were in operation. Primarily they feared that such programs might become unduly "vocational." They assumed that a strong liberal arts background was needed for the successful practice of social work. They feared undergraduate courses in social work would be unduly technical and that students enrolled in an accelerated program would be less well-prepared in the liberal arts than were the traditional students.

They felt that other possible defects of accelerated education might not become visible immediately. At the point of graduation students in both programs might appear to be equivalent in their performance. Yet accelerated students might be less well-prepared to move ahead in their practice. Or a decay effect might be operating among them. In other words, the loss of a year of education might have a negative effect that would become apparent only at some future point. To examine these possibilities, a decision was made to conduct a follow-up study of accelerated and traditional students after they had graduated and entered practice.

In this chapter we present data that bear upon two questions:

1. Were there differences in the academic and educational background of students enrolled in the accelerated and traditional programs?
2. Did accelerated and traditional students differ in their practice one year after graduation?

ACADEMIC BACKGROUND

Three measures were used to examine the academic background of students in the accelerated and traditional programs: (1) scores on the Graduate Record Examination (GRE); (2) the undergraduate Quality Point Average (QPA); and (3) undergraduate transcripts of courses.

Graduate Record Examination

The GRE was selected as a useful indicator of a student's preparation for graduate study. The test seeks to measure a person's "ability to read with comprehension, think logically, see relationships, perform basic mathematical operations and interpret data."[1]

Often GRE scores are used in making decisions regarding the admission of students to graduate schools. Recently the validity of these scores has been under attack because of the comparatively low scores generally achieved by certain ethnic minorities. The directors of the testing service are sensitive to such criticism and they make this statement in their defense: "scores in the GRE, as on other tests of this kind, never completely represent the potential of any student. This is especially true for American Indian, Black, Mexican-American, and Puerto Rican students whose educational experience, in and out of school, has differed significantly from that of the great majority of students."[2]

Many social work students were aware of the past misuse of GRE scores. For this reason a number of them were reluctant to participate in this phase of the evaluation. In general, students were most cooperative (see Chapter 3). Most of them agreed to sit for a full day of testing. Yet some were so opposed to the GRE that the researcher was asked to remove it from the test battery. Despite these pressures, we made a decision to continue using the GRE.

Because of the pressure from students, an error was made with Cycle II students. The accelerated students were mistakenly asked to sit for the GRE as seniors, *before* they had completed their undergraduate course work. Traditional students sat for the test after having received their baccalaureate degree. Consequently the scores of accelerated students in Cycle II were not comparable and were omitted from this study. To replace this group, we substituted the scores of 1[illegible] accelerated students who completed their undergraduate work in 1972. The class of 1972 did not participate in the evaluation study aside from sitting for the GRE.

The GRE scores in Tables 5-1 and 5-2 are presented separately for men and women. This procedure is followed because the GRE norms for men and women are somewhat different. Usually the verbal scores of women and the quantitative scores of men are higher. Table 5-1 shows that for men the GRE scores of traditional students were considerably higher than those of accelerated students. This was true of both the verbal and quantitative scores. The mean verbal score was 467 for accelerated students and

550 for traditional students, a difference of 83. The standard error of the mean was 32. The mean quantitative score was 408 for accelerated students and 470 for traditional students, a difference of 62.

TABLE 5-1
GRE Scores for Males

Students	*N*	*Verbal Score*	*Percentile Rank*	*Quantitative Score*	*Percentile Rank*
Accelerated	11	467	39	408	15
Traditional	22	550	64	470	28
Difference		83		62	

The scores of the women were much closer than those of the men. Table 5-2 shows that the verbal score was 510 for accelerated students and 555 for traditional students, a difference of 45 points. The quantitative scores were much more similar: the average score was 404 for accelerated students and 411 for traditional students, a difference of only 7 points.

TABLE 5-2
GRE Scores for Females

Students	*N*	*Verbal Score*	*Percentile Rank*	*Quantitative Score*	*Percentile Rank*
Accelerated	41	510	48	404	29
Traditional	35	555	61	411	31
Difference		45		7	

In short, for both men and women the verbal and quantitative scores were higher for traditional students. The differences on the verbal test were sizable for both males and females, and on the quantitative test, for males only. On the basis of the GRE scores, we must conclude that traditional students' preparation for graduate study was superior to that of accelerated students.

Quality Point Average

A second measure of the students' academic background was their Quality Point Average (QPA). The QPA is obtained by assigning a rating of "4" to a letter grade of "A," a rating of "3" to a letter grade of "B," and so on. The number of credits for each course is multiplied by the rating and the scores are then added together. To obtain the QPA, the total score is divided by the total number of credits. The results were as follows:

the QPA was 3.41 for accelerated students and 2.73 for traditional students. Thus the QPA of accelerated students was much higher than that of traditional students ($p < .05$). These results were *not consistent* with those obtained from the GRE.

There is little point in speculating at length about the reasons for this inconsistency even though it is tempting to do so. Usually a researcher has few chances to indulge his fancy. Most of the time he is a drudge trying to clean up a mass of data.

The plain fact is this: data are not available that would enable us to choose between several rival explanations whose implications would be embarrassing for others. Therefore we will confine ourselves to pointing out only one obvious explanation: the GRE and the QPA measure different abilities.

Students who earn higher grades do not necessarily acquire more information. In all likelihood they are skilled in the arts of "impression management." Those technically accomplished in these arts may have polished their skills because they are less endowed than high GRE scorers with the "ability to think logically and perform basic mathematical operations and interpret data." In a more perfect world the scores of the GRE and QPA would be highly correlated. In this world, at this time, it is probably sensible to recognize the difference between the two measures and make use of both.

Undergraduate Courses

We anticipated that accelerated students would have enrolled in more social and behavioral science courses, since to graduate as a social welfare major they had to complete a number of courses in that department. Also, because of their interest in social welfare, one would expect them to elect additional courses in the social sciences.

The findings in Table 5-3 show little difference between accelerated and traditional students in the number of courses that they had completed in the social and behavioral sciences. The mean number of courses was 11.98 for accelerated and 12.19 for traditional students. Another way to view the data is to assume that the average student completes 10 courses a year or 40 courses in his four years of college. Then the proportion of social and behavioral courses was .30 for accelerated students and .31 for traditional students.

The major difference between the students was in the courses in which they enrolled, not in the number. Traditional students were much more likely to enroll in psychology courses than accelerated students: a mean of 4.57 to 3.42. Accelerated students, however, were much more likely to enroll in sociology and anthropology: a mean of 6.11 to 5.05. This difference in course selection may have reflected differences in the course requirements needed for graduation among the two groups. In our opinion,

TABLE 5-3
Student Enrollment in Undergraduate Courses in the Social and Behavioral Sciences

Course	*Accelerated Students (N=47)*		*Traditional Students (N=61)*	
	Number of Courses	*Mean*	*Number of Courses*	*Mean*
Psychology	161	3.42	279	4.57
Sociology	217	4.62	252	4.13
Anthropology	70	1.49	56	0.92
Economics	53	1.13	80	1.31
Politics and Government	62	1.32	77	1.26
Total	563	11.98	744	12.19

both accelerated and traditional students were equally well-prepared as judged by the number of social and behavioral science courses in which they enrolled. No invidious comparisons were warranted about the greater value of psychology or sociology courses—both are valuable.

In summary, accelerated and traditional students were somewhat different in their academic and educational backgrounds. For males, the GRE scores of traditional students were decidedly higher than those of accelerated students. The differences in the GRE scores for women were less pronounced. Nonetheless, the differences ran in the same direction as did the scores for men. Clearly, the GRE scores of traditional students were higher. The results of the GRE, however, were not consistent with the QPA, since the QPA of accelerated students was considerably higher than that of traditional students.

Both groups of students enrolled in approximately the same number of courses in the social and behavioral sciences. The average accelerated student enrolled in 12.0 courses and the average traditional student in 12.2 courses. The major difference was that traditional students were more likely to enroll in psychology courses and accelerated students in sociology and anthropology courses.

The findings were clear. The interpretation, however, was not. Since the findings showed differences in GRE and QPA, different interpretations of data were possible. In our view, the differences observed in the students' academic and educational background were of limited importance. More important than the differences was the marked similarity of the students, which should not be discounted because we were intent on finding differences. Specifically we mention the following: all of the students in both groups were college graduates; all of them were interested in pursuing a course of graduate study; all of them sought training in the same profession; and all had similar background characteristics (see Chapter 3). Differences in the two groups have been identified. The importance of these differences, not their statistical significance is questioned.

PRACTICE SKILL ONE YEAR AFTER

The follow-up research on students' practice performance following their first year of work experience as full-fledged social workers called for certain strategies. Each accelerated and traditional student was informed beforehand about the nature and purpose of the one-year-after study. They were told that their future supervisors would be asked to complete a slightly different version of the PSAI. The students themselves were asked to notify the school of any change in their address. In this way they could be reached when the time came to secure their consent in order to contact their new field instructors. Marianne Welter designed the following procedures to obtain optimal results in the data collection:

1. Each fall, shortly before the completion of their first year of full-time work, students were sent a letter reminding them of the importance of the follow-up. They were asked to give consent so that their current supervisors could be contacted.
2. A follow-up letter was sent to students who failed to reply. Also, attempts were made to telephone them. If these attempts failed a third set of letters was sent out.
3. Additional efforts were made to trace the students whose whereabouts was unknown. Sometimes this extra "detective work" succeeded in reestablishing contact with them.
4. After permission was received, a letter was sent to each supervisor. This letter was designed to enlist the supervisors' interest and cooperation. In addition, detailed instructions were included about how to complete the enclosed PSAI questionnaire.
5. Telephone calls were made for the purpose of further motivating the supervisors. These calls also served to improve their understanding of the PSAI and to answer any questions about it.

Despite these efforts, data on the performance of 17 students were not available for this last phase of the study. Table 5-4 shows that 85 percent of the students took part in the one-year-after study. The following reasons accounted for the attrition: the address of 6 students was unknown; three supervisors failed to return the PSAI form; and 8 students worked without any supervision or their supervisors were not sufficiently familiar with their practice.

The items used to examine practice skill one year after graduation were somewhat different from those used in the PSAI. Changes in the PSAI items were necessary because the students had graduated and become social workers. Their performance now had to be judged against that of

TABLE 5-4
Reasons for Attrition in the One-Year-After Study

Reasons	*Accelerated Students*	*Traditional Students*	*Total*
Address unknown	2	4	6
Supervisor did not return form	1	2	3
Lack of practice supervision	2	6	8
Total	5	12	17
Participants in one-year-after study (%)	89	80	85

other social workers and the items had to reflect their change of status. In developing this one-year-after instrument it was necessary to drop a few items and to add three new ones. In this chapter the items are grouped together for purposes of analysis in the same way as those comprising the PSAI.

Table 5-5 compares the ratings for community items of accelerated and traditionally trained social workers. Only Item 2 showed a difference between the two groups that was statistically significant. The ratings of traditionally trained social workers however were somewhat higher for three of the four items.

TABLE 5-5
Community Items One Year After

	Students	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*t-Test Value*	*Level of Probability*
Item 1	Accelerated	42	6.71	1.52		
	Traditional	43	7.16	1.46	−1.6960	ns
Item 2	Accelerated	42	7.07	1.44		
	Traditional	44	7.52	1.11	−2.2233	<.05
Item 3	Accelerated	39	5.87	2.33		
	Traditional	43	5.84	2.03	0.1502	ns
Item 4	Accelerated	41	7.02	1.56		
	Traditional	45	7.09	1.66	−0.3727	ns

Table 5-6 compares the ratings for the seven agency items. For five of the seven, the ratings of traditionally trained social workers tended to be higher, but the differences were not large enough to be statistically significant.

TABLE 5-6
Agency Items One Year After

	Students	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Test Value	Level of Probability
Item 5	Accelerated	42	7.40	1.15		
	Traditional	45	7.69	1.08	−1.6299	ns
Item 6	Accelerated	42	7.00	1.45		
	Traditional	45	7.40	1.40	−1.6368	ns
Item 7	Accelerated	41	6.49	1.66		
	Traditional	45	6.58	1.69	−0.3787	ns
Item 8	Accelerated	42	6.88	1.74		
	Traditional	45	7.18	1.56	−1.2146	ns
Item 9	Accelerated	42	7.62	1.58		
	Traditional	45	7.44	1.47	0.0715	ns
Item 10	Accelerated	42	7.52	1.25		
	Traditional	45	7.49	1.59	0.3660	ns
Item 11	Accelerated	42	6.69	1.60		
	Traditional	45	7.04	1.46	−1.5036	ns

Table 5-7 compares the ratings for the nine social worker items. None of the differences between the two groups was statistically significant. But the same trend was evident here as in the two previous tables. For eight of the nine items the ratings of traditionally trained social workers were higher.

Table 5-8 compares the ratings for the 18 client items. Only one of these was statistically significant, Item 37. For 16 of the 18 items the ratings of traditionally trained social workers were higher.

Table 5-9 compares the ratings for the 15 casework items. Only one of these was statistically significant, Item 39. Once again, the same general trend was noted. For 12 of the 15 items the ratings of traditionally trained social workers were higher.

In summary the ratings of accelerated and traditionally trained social workers showed a consistent trend after they had been in practice for one year. For most of the items the differences between the two groups were generally small. Rarely were they statistically significant. For example, Tables 5-5 through 5-9 present the findings on 53 separate items. Of these, only 3 (Items 2, 37, 39) were statistically significant at the .05 level. If the level of analysis was item-by-item, the difference in ratings of both groups appeared generally insignificant.

When the overall pattern of the items was examined, however, it was possible to arrive at a different view. Table 5-10 is a summary table. It contains the Average Rating of the Individual Items (ARII) that relate to per-

TABLE 5-7
Social Worker Items One Year After

	Students	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*t-Test Value*	*Level of Probability*
Item 12	Accelerated	42	6.62	1.71		
	Traditional	45	6.84	1.91	−0.9798	ns
Item 13	Accelerated	42	6.93	1.52		
	Traditional	44	6.89	1.57	0.2135	ns
Item 14	Accelerated	42	6.76	1.83		
	Traditional	45	6.84	1.72	−0.4517	ns
Item 15	Accelerated	42	6.81	1.45		
	Traditional	45	7.07	1.66	−1.0425	ns
Item 16	Accelerated	42	6.52	1.74		
	Traditional	43	7.19	1.56	−1.9103	ns
Item 17	Accelerated	42	6.79	1.16		
	Traditional	45	7.07	1.36	−1.2581	ns
Item 18	Accelerated	42	7.17	1.45		
	Traditional	45	7.24	1.38	−0.7385	ns
Item 19	Accelerated	42	6.76	1.82		
	Traditional	45	6.84	1.65	−0.5254	ns
Item 20	Accelerated	42	6.95	1.53		
	Traditional	44	7.32	1.27	−1.6170	ns

formance in five areas: community, agency, social worker, client, and casework. For example, the ARII for the four community items was 6.67 for accelerated and 6.90 for traditional social workers. Thus the traditional group was 0.23 higher. This same trend was observed for each of the other areas. For the agency items the ARII of traditional social workers was higher, 7.26 to 7.09; the average difference was 0.17. The ARII's of traditional social workers were also higher for the social worker items (7.03 to 6.81), the client items (7.08 to 6.81), and the casework items (7.03 to 6.79). The differences for these items were respectively 0.22, 0.27, and 0.24. The average difference remained remarkably consistent from area to area, with a fluctuation between 0.17 and 0.27. In addition, the direction was always the same: the ARII's of traditional social workers were always higher than those of accelerated.

If we direct our attention to the general pattern rather than to the analysis of individual items, these small consistent differences between the two groups increase in importance. In order to carry out this kind of analysis we divided all of the 106 average ratings into two groups, one consisting of all average ratings above the median, and the other of all average

TABLE 5-8
Client Items One Year After

	Students	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*t-Test Value*	*Level of Probability*
Item 21	Accelerated	42	6.93	1.50		
	Traditional	44	7.32	1.14	−1.6355	ns
Item 22	Accelerated	42	7.05	1.51		
	Traditional	44	7.11	1.22	−0.5852	ns
Item 23	Accelerated	42	6.60	1.85		
	Traditional	42	6.79	1.44	−0.9016	ns
Item 24	Accelerated	42	6.79	1.75		
	Traditional	44	7.09	1.44	−1.2700	ns
Item 25	Accelerated	42	6.60	1.50		
	Traditional	44	6.60	1.41	−0.5253	ns
Item 26	Accelerated	42	6.59	1.51		
	Traditional	42	7.29	1.22	−1.5313	ns
Item 27	Accelerated	42	6.55	1.68		
	Traditional	44	6.77	1.29	−1.1918	ns
Item 28	Accelerated	42	6.60	1.74		
	Traditional	44	7.02	1.28	−1.7195	ns
Item 29	Accelerated	42	6.74	1.64		
	Traditional	44	6.75	1.57	−0.4484	ns
Item 30	Accelerated	42	6.60	1.59		
	Traditional	42	6.88	1.43	−1.0426	ns
Item 31	Accelerated	41	6.73	1.86		
	Traditional	41	7.05	1.41	−0.9822	ns
Item 32	Accelerated	42	7.24	1.45		
	Traditional	43	7.21	1.19	0.4199	ns
Item 33	Accelerated	42	7.29	1.29		
	Traditional	42	7.19	1.52	0.2322	ns
Item 34	Accelerated	41	6.71	1.75		
	Traditional	41	7.05	1.48	−1.5721	ns
Item 35	Accelerated	41	6.95	1.86		
	Traditional	39	7.05	1.61	−0.7002	ns
Item 36	Accelerated	39	6.54	1.86		
	Traditional	36	7.19	1.31	−1.1324	ns
Item 37	Accelerated	42	7.31	1.75		
	Traditional	42	7.93	0.97	−2.6265	<.05
Item 38	Accelerated	41	6.83	1.34		
	Traditional	42	7.24	1.10	−1.9490	ns

TABLE 5-9
Casework Items One Year After

	Students	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Test Value	Level of Probability
Item 39	Accelerated	40	6.60	1.45		
	Traditional	45	7.13	1.38	−2.0065	<.05
Item 40	Accelerated	40	6.72	1.58		
	Traditional	45	7.18	1.25	−1.7053	ns
Item 41	Accelerated	40	6.88	1.64		
	Traditional	44	7.14	1.37	−1.0937	ns
Item 42	Accelerated	40	6.70	1.57		
	Traditional	45	7.11	1.35	−1.4318	ns
Item 43	Accelerated	40	6.92	1.35		
	Traditional	43	7.05	1.29	−0.8076	ns
Item 44	Accelerated	39	6.33	1.54		
	Traditional	41	6.85	1.51	−1.5848	ns
Item 45	Accelerated	40	6.48	1.55		
	Traditional	38	6.68	1.53	−0.4549	ns
Item 46	Accelerated	40	6.85	1.42		
	Traditional	43	6.98	1.49	−0.6237	ns
Item 47	Accelerated	40	7.05	1.66		
	Traditional	41	7.22	1.39	−0.6988	ns
Item 48	Accelerated	40	6.90	1.65		
	Traditional	41	6.85	1.56	0.2962	ns
Item 49	Accelerated	39	7.54	1.19		
	Traditional	42	7.41	1.19	0.2589	ns
Item 50	Accelerated	40	6.78	1.07		
	Traditional	41	6.76	1.50	0.3737	ns
Item 51	Accelerated	35	6.97	1.32		
	Traditional	33	7.09	1.53	−0.1685	ns
Item 52	Accelerated	35	6.63	1.42		
	Traditional	33	6.94	1.48	−0.6553	ns
Item 53	Accelerated	35	6.54	1.27		
	Traditional	33	7.00	1.71	−1.1265	ns

ratings below. The median rating for the 106 average ratings was 6.94.

The ratings of traditional social workers were consistently higher. Of the 53 ratings above the median, 37 or 70 percent were those of traditional social workers, and only 16 or 30 percent were those of accelerated. This trend was strong and consistent and statistically significant ($p < .05$). It should not be overlooked or ignored because it did not appear in an item-by-item analysis of the data.

The problem of interpreting the data becomes one of considering two trends in regard to one of the questions to be answered by this study: Did accelerated and traditional students differ in their practice one year after graduation? The answer is clear—the students did differ. The supervisory ratings of traditional students were consistently higher than those of accelerated, but were of a small magnitude. Supervisors rated both groups on a 9-point scale and the average difference was only 0.23. Of the 53 items, only 3 were statistically significant.

TABLE 5-10
Summary Table, One Year After

	Mean		
	Accelerated	*Traditional*	*Difference*
Community Items	6.67	6.90	0.23
Agency Items	7.09	7.26	0.17
Social Worker Items	6.81	7.03	0.22
Client Items	6.81	7.08	0.27
Casework Items	6.79	7.03	0.24
Total	6.83	7.07	0.23

Once again the facts are clear; and once again the data can be interpreted differently. In our view the differences do not raise serious doubt about the value of accelerated education. To do this, the average of the average differences one year after graduation would have to be greater than 0.23 on a 9-point scale.

NOTES

1. *Guide to the Use of the GRE Scores in Graduate Admissions, 1971-72* (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1971).
2. *Ibid.*

Chapter 6

Coping with Feelings of Inferiority: Students' Experiences in the Accelerated Program

by Aaron Rosenblatt

The major evaluation of accelerated education centered around the learning that students had acquired during their course of study. Aside from providing quantitative data, they were also asked to report on their subjective experiences. These data were qualitative in nature. Through discussions with accelerated students we learned about their major problems and the ways in which they coped with them. This chapter is based on the personal accounts of students—their fears and anxieties that resulted from having participated in an experimental program.

The data for this chapter were gathered by tape recording group interviews with the accelerated students. From 1971–73 three cohorts were interviewed early in May, the month before they graduated. Each interview lasted one-and-a-half to two hours. Usually the students were divided into groups of 7 or 8 to allow each student ample opportunity to participate actively in the interview. Of the 47 accelerated students who graduated, 43 participated in the interview sessions.

Students received assurance that their comments would be anonymous. They did not seem worried about any breach of confidence, perhaps because they were soon to graduate. In addition, one must also consider that some of them lived through a period when professors and administrative officers were openly criticized and challenged by militant groups of students. Regardless of the reasons, the discussion was frank and open. Students named names. They were honest. Some evaluations of the program and the faculty were favorable; others were not. They felt free to criticize certain aspects of the Adelphi University School of Social Work and the accelerated program.

There was considerable banter and laughter during the discussions. These seemed to ease any feelings of anxiety that may have resulted from the frank expression of opinion. For example, during the discussion students might learn for the first time that they disagreed with one another about some part of the program. One liked a particular course; another found it a complete waste of time. In the discussion that ensued, the students often reached a consensus about certain experiences. They might differ on particular points, but in general they expressed considerable agreement.

In the group interview, students were asked to compare the accelerated and the traditional program. They were asked if there was any difference in the two academic programs or in the two fieldwork programs. They were also asked which aspects of the program they liked the most and which the least. In the course of the interviews they described their relationship with both groups of students, and with classroom and fieldwork faculty. Much of this chapter is based on their feelings about their preparation for becoming social workers while they were students. Toward the end of the interview, they were asked to answer these two questions:

1. Do you feel better prepared, worse prepared, or equally prepared than most students in the traditional program?
2. If you had to do it all over again, would you enroll in the accelerated program?

This chapter is divided into three sections. In the first, we will examine differences that became the basis for making invidious distinctions between the two groups of students. In the second, we will identify mechanisms by which the accelerated students coped with their situation. These two sections contain primarily students who graduated in 1971 and 1972. Their experience was remarkably similar. In the third section, we will report on the experience of the 1973 graduates, which was quite different from that of earlier graduates. We also will suggest explanations that may account for these differences.

BECOMING OUTSIDERS

Accelerated students used traditional students as a positive reference group for making judgments about themselves. Traditional students were the dominant group. The traditional two-year program was legitimated by practice, usage, and the Council on Social Work Education. Accelerated students had to arrive at some definition of themselves in reference to the ways they differed from the dominant group.

Accelerated students lacked an objective measure by which to determine whether or not their performance was equal, inferior, or superior to that of most traditional students. Since the data in previous chapters of this study were not available to them, they had to form a judgment about their performance.

Generally, the first two cohorts of accelerated students felt that traditional students had received a "preferable" type of training. The social position of traditional students was more secure, and most accelerated students viewed themselves as inferior during the earlier phases of the program.

Differences between groups in a competitive society rarely remain at a descriptive level. Interested parties generally transform these into invidious comparisons. As accelerated students became aware of differences in their education and training they quickly developed a perspective that put them at a disadvantage. They became the "deprived" and the traditional students, the "affluent."

Accelerated students felt their "second-class" status most keenly while they were seniors in the undergraduate social welfare program. Everyone referred to them as "experimental" students. They thought of themselves in this way. Consequently, they had reason to doubt that their education was equal to that of "regular" students enrolled in the traditional two-year program.

By the end of the program their thinking had changed. Most came to think of themselves as equally competent. Indeed, a few developed a belief that their education was superior. If granted a second opportunity, all said that they would again choose to enter the accelerated program.

We have examined the process by which accelerated students came to view themselves as outsiders. Below we identify the referents they invoked in arriving at this perspective.

Class and Field Instruction

Accelerated students spent less time in their field placements as seniors than traditional students did as first-year students. The accelerated students felt deprived. One day a week in the field was "totally inadequate." There was not "enough continuity" in their cases. Too much happened during the rest of the week when they were away from the agency. Also, accelerated students felt that they "did not fit into the placement," since it was designed for traditional students who spent more time in the field, and field instruction was geared to their needs.

Problems in fieldwork carried over into the classroom. To complete some classroom assignments students were required to report on their experience with clients. A number of accelerated students had difficulty in writing these papers. Because of their limited fieldwork they lacked suitable cases and complained about a "lack of integration" between class and field instruction.

Lastly, some accelerated students assumed that their instruction in undergraduate courses was in some way inferior. They would have preferred to sit in the graduate classes with traditional students. Only undergraduates were enrolled in those courses that were part of the undergraduate curriculum. They felt that traditional students learned more in graduate courses. Thus some accelerated students thought they "lacked as many concepts" as traditional students were acquiring. So in both the field and classroom, accelerated students felt they were learning less.

Age and Experience

Most accelerated students were younger than traditional students. Age, in itself, is not always a disadvantage. But in this instance age was coupled with inexperience. Many of the traditional students had worked in social welfare agencies before entering graduate school. The accelerated students equated greater experience with greater knowledge. They failed to recognize that some traditional students might experience difficulty because they had acquired the wrong kind of knowledge. That is, they might have learned techniques and procedures that were considered appropriate in public welfare but not approved by social work faculty. Accelerated students seemed unaware that such students would have the difficult task of unlearning the "knowledge" they had gained through their earlier experience.

Accelerated students felt their lack of experience keenly. They considered themselves doubly at a disadvantage. Firstly, those more experienced were precisely the ones receiving more fieldwork experience. Secondly, fieldwork in their senior year was restricted to one day a week. Consequently, accelerated students assumed that they "were falling further behind." They feared that they would never be able to "absorb everything that they needed."

Social Position in the School

Sometimes feelings of inferiority were confirmed by traditional students and faculty. Many traditional students seemed to resent the accelerated group. In one social policy seminar this question was discussed: Should the school be pushing accelerated students through its program so quickly?

Some faculty openly expressed doubts about the accelerated program. One member questioned whether accelerated students were as well prepared as traditional students. Another reportedly made "snide remarks" about the accelerated program. The "underlying message," as decoded by accelerated students, was that they were "too young to know anything." When accelerated students performed well, faculty members seemed surprised. The students learned from some faculty that they were "moving at a slower pace." It was cold comfort to hear that "they would make it up" during the summer.

One student became quite anxious when a faculty member discussed her inexperience and lack of preparation. The faculty member told the student that she was "being damaged" by trying to remain in the program. For a time this student considered dropping out of the program.

Some of the 1972 graduates likened themselves to members of a minority group: "We didn't feel included. We wanted to be part of what was going on, but no one was interested in including us." "If I wanted to be included in an activity," one accelerated student noted, "I had to force my way in." Another said: "We were not even allowed to ride in the back of the bus." A third commented: "No one spoke to me at orientation. If I opened my mouth, they all froze me out."

Here is another illustration of the students' feelings of marginality in the social structure of the school: "Every class had a student representative to the sequences. I never knew one existed. How did you become a representative? No one told me. I didn't know what was going on. I wasn't asked. I wasn't involved. I had to learn on my own."

Accelerated students were singled out in another way. The school used different procedures in evaluating students. Accelerated students received letter grades, but the traditional students received pass-fail grades since they were in graduate school. When faculty forgot about this distinction, accelerated students had to remind them. At the library desk, accelerated students also received unfavorable treatment. They were seniors, not graduate students. Thus they had fewer library privileges. Also even though they were seniors, they did not fit easily into the student association, where most of the members were traditional students. All of this was disheartening. Accelerated students felt that they were "undergraduates and yet not undergraduates;" that they were "graduate students and yet not graduate students."

The status of experimental student seemed to follow them like an unwelcome odor. They thought of themselves as outsiders. They wanted the full rights and privileges of graduate students, yet they had to do without these while they were seniors in the undergraduate program. By the time they received their baccalaureate, they felt themselves inferior to traditional students. A year later, at the end of their graduate studies, the gap had narrowed. Indeed, it seemed to have disappeared. The next section identifies the mechanisms used in overcoming the presumed deficits of the "experimental" program.

BECOMING INSIDERS— HEIGHTENED MOTIVATION TO LEARN

Accelerated students suffered from feelings of being second best. This, however, proved to be an advantage to them. Because they felt they knew less, they felt the need to work harder. "Because of our feelings of inadequacy," said one student, "we did a lot more reading than second-year students. We did a lot more work on our own." In this way accelerated students believed they were able to catch up and become familiar with the language and concepts that traditional students appeared to use so confidently.

Accelerated students also made great demands on their fieldwork instructors. They "pushed harder" and "worked harder" than did traditional students. Besides trying to catch up, some students had another reason for pushing so hard. As one expressed it: "being in an experiment, I felt I had to make the grade. I was being tested." In this instance it appeared as if the research itself may have spurred them on to greater effort.

Another reported that accelerated students were able "to invest ourselves more" in studying. "We are more questioning, not always knowing. There is no vested interest in being perfect because we were not perfect for so long."

This preference for their once despised status will be noted again at a later point. Here we see that being second best need not be a permanent status. Position is based on achievement. If one recognizes one's disadvantages, one can mount a campaign to try to overcome them. Furthermore, once one succeeds in overcoming the disadvantages, he is strengthened by the ordeal that he has passed through on the journey to parity. Being second best, trying harder, leads to the possibility of one day surpassing those who are presently number one. The summer program proved to be an ordeal to the accelerated students. Meeting its heavy demands helped make them feel as competent as traditional students.

HEIGHTENED DEMANDS OF THE SUMMER PROGRAM

Rites of passage are a well-known mechanism that serve to mark the transition from one status to another. Often the change is officially recognized after the initiate has undergone an ordeal successfully. Completion of the trial symbolically marks the move from one status to another. A latent function of the summer program was to serve this purpose for the accelerated students.[1]

A manifest function, of course, was to provide an equivalent experience to the first-year fieldwork program of traditional students. But the summer took on special meaning for them. Accelerated students who had previously passed through the summer program warned the next cycle of students: "Wait 'til the summer." Some of the students anticipated the start of the long-desired, intensive fieldwork experience with trepidation. One worried about lacking the background necessary to work four days a week.

The effects of the summer program were viewed by students as follows:

> The majority of growing that I did was during the summer. I wouldn't have as much confidence in myself without the summer . . . You kept going . . . It was too intense.

> After a while I used to wonder if I knew where I was and what I was doing.
>
> It helped me tremendously to continue during the summer while the other students were away from school. You have to be able to tolerate a lot of stress.
>
> Being there four days a week, you really felt part of the staff. There was a lot of continuity [something that students felt was lacking in their undergraduate experience]. I had some grasp of what was happening in the agency and what I could do. I realized that I could do it. Working one day a week I did not know what social work was.

The students were willing to acknowledge that after the summer, gaps still remained in their education. But this did not detract from the value of the summer. "Perhaps I should know much more than I do. But after the summer we knew what it was all about. Other students are not doing any more than we do." Said another relieved student: "In the summer I really started to feel I belonged somewhere and I was on my way somewhere."

AWARENESS OF CHANGING STATUS

The students wanted to become full-fledged graduate students. They wanted to succeed in their training. Additional structural mechanisms, both formal and informal, helped them realize not only that change was possible but that it was actually occurring.

One simple, official act held considerable meaning for the students: notice of their formal admission to graduate school. As seniors, they had complained about not knowing if they were undergraduate or graduate students. After notification of their admission, they registered as graduate students. They knew they were on their way.

The second cohort of students benefited from their informal meeting with students from the previous cohort. The latter served as a positive reference group. Their existence proved that it was possible to complete the program. Furthermore, graduates of the accelerated program found jobs as social workers. Their success was viewed as proof by the next group that the program was accomplishing its goals.

Members of the second cohort were aware of the comfort they derived from the previous cohort. "It was a nice feeling to see past students working at the same agency and to know that the program could work." They talked to their predecessors and learned from them. They were visible, welcome confirmation that the program was "really working."

The accelerated students also recognized changes in themselves when, as second-year students, they came to have dealings with first-year students. In these encounters they realized that they themselves were "more advanced." A few accelerated students were given responsibility for orienting entering first-year students. This duty also helped confirm their status as bona fide second-year students.

GREATER INTERACTION WITH TRADITIONAL STUDENTS

Accelerated students initially developed unrealistic expectations about the competence of traditional students. Typically they voiced such expectations as these: "They're top notch and they are going to know it all." They "have read all the books and are able to conceptualize like mad." "In therapy they would know what to do."

Gradually, accelerated students gained a more balanced view of traditional students. This development was hastened by their complete integration with traditional students in class and fieldwork during the second year. By learning more about traditional students, they began to view themselves more positively.

For example, they learned that traditional students also felt inadequate at times even though they "looked so confident." Accelerated students now had increased opportunities to spend more time with traditional students. They talked to them about their cases, their class work, and their fieldwork placements. From these discussions they "began finding out that they were human." One student concluded: "As we discussed our cases I came to realize that they really didn't know as much as I had given them credit for knowing. They also had problems." Another student reported that he suddenly realized that everybody was encountering some difficulty. Said another: "In the field we were all on the same level. I was doing the same amount of work and doing it as well."

Some accelerated students applied the social work skills that they had recently acquired in analyzing the statements of traditional students. "My professors taught me too much. My diagnostic skills are good. I began to recognize their lacks." Another boldly interpreted the motivation accounting for the behavior of his "betters." "I didn't feel accepted by second-year students. Some of them laughed at experimental students because they were going through the program in one year. They have contempt for people who come to the school with experience and get credit for one year of training."

In other words, accelerated students began to question the basis for the traditional students' feelings of superiority. Instead of giving ready acceptance to their own inferior status, as they once had, they were now seeking to account for the traditional students' need to feel superior.

Increased familiarity sometimes bred contempt. Sitting in the same classroom, accelerated students listened "to the dumb questions they [traditional students] ask. When you listen to them, you know they can't help a client." In the classroom, accelerated students also had an opportunity to learn that "they knew more than some of them. We got a feeling of how much they didn't know. They didn't know any more than we do."

One student was pleased to hear that some traditional students had trouble completing certain papers. He himself had not experienced any difficulty in completing the assignments. After talking to them about their troubles he learned "how shallow their thinking was."

Clearly, during their final year, the accelerated students were ready to right the balance with traditional students. Some of the above quotations show that they did so with a vengeance. Perhaps they overreacted. Nonetheless, the net effect was obvious: increased exposure to traditional students helped to diminish feelings of inferiority among the accelerated group.

SOCIAL SUPPORT AND GROUP SOLIDARITY

How we think about ourselves is in part determined by how others think of us. Man is not an island. Therefore it is important to consider the response of students, fieldwork and classroom instructors, and others whom accelerated students saw frequently.

A positive evaluation by a "significant other" helped accelerated students have more faith in themselves. When one student spoke about feeling inadequate as a worker, her supervisor pointed out that *all* students feel that way. At first an accelerated student might think that traditional students knew what they were doing all the time; eventually they learned from others that all students suffer from the same problems.

One student reported the effect of a supervisor complimenting her on satisfactorily discharging her fieldwork responsibilities. The student "began to realize that she was relating differently to clients." She felt more comfortable with them. She was "not doing instinctive stuff anymore."

Another recalled the strength she had gained from a doctor's positive evaluation of her work. The doctor told her: "I hope you can work with me all of the time. You're one of the best social workers here." After that the student thought to herself: "I must be doing something right." She also began to recognize that she "could do the job."

Some of the students also gained support from a number of faculty members, both class and field, who "were invested in the program." They wanted it to succeed. "Either consciously or unconsciously they tried to enrich the students' experience." One student had been uncertain about finishing the program. However, support from her advisor and supervisor enabled her to remain and finish her studies.

So far we have discussed the support from professional workers. Student support was also extremely valuable. Mention was made earlier of the comfort accelerated students derived from their predecessors. Accelerated students also drew support from one another. They developed close ties among themselves. "We became a group, a clique." "We developed a close identification, closer than with anyone else." "We lived through something. Even though we might not be best friends, there is a warmth among us without feeling that we have to be best friends."

The students believed that this closeness was special. It was different from the usual closeness some students have for one another. It resulted in part from feeling excluded from the student body. Sharing this experience drew them closer. At least they had each other—which was more than some traditional students had. "A lot of [traditional] students had no groups to be part of. They were individuals. We were a lot less lonely than the other students. We had each other."

Friends, of course, are no substitute for feeling confident about one's ability. Nonetheless, the solidarity of the group and the support they received from other students undoubtedly enabled them to release feelings of tension. This relief helped them to expend effort on the main task of completing their education and becoming social workers.

COMPENSATORY FEELINGS OF SUPERIORITY

As undergraduates, the accelerated students had felt that their preparation was inferior to that of traditional students. At the point of graduation they had come to believe their preparation was at least equal. Indeed some accelerated students were prepared to argue that their preparation was superior, because there was much greater continuity between undergraduate and graduate school. Much of the knowledge acquired in undergraduate school was still "fresh in their minds." This was not the case with many traditional students. Faculty often had to repeat information for traditional students. Some had never learned it. Others had long since forgotten what they once knew.

In time, accelerated students began to recognize that they were not deprived in one critical aspect. In their view, the undergraduate academic program in social welfare had certain special merits, since it was designed to provide them with a rich background for entrance into the social work profession. Traditional students, in contrast, had majored in a variety of undergraduate programs. Consequently, some accelerated students argued that their academic preparation was better.

Accelerated students also felt better prepared because of the great demands made upon them. They spoke of numerous deadlines and increased workloads—"all those crises" that had to be overcome. Also, the rigors of the summer program added to their special preparation.

Accelerated students began to reconsider the weight that should be given to the more extensive experience of their rivals. At the point of graduation, previous work experience seemed much less important. The earlier high evaluation stemmed from a period when accelerated students had been social work virgins, filled with desire but without field experience.

In 1971 and 1972, graduates did not make a strong case for their superiority. Rather they seemed to be affirming a right to feel just as capable as traditional students. They had moved a long distance from the time they were frightened seniors. They had thrown off early feelings of being second-class students, as well as their doubts about the program and their competence as practitioners.

THE 1973 GRADUATES

The experience of the 1973 graduates (Cycle IV) differed from that of earlier cycles. These students did not recall being overwhelmed by anxiety. On the contrary, they were rather self-assured. After having listened to the woes of three previous groups, we were surprised to interview a group of accelerated students who were rather blasé about the prospect of completing their education in five years instead of six.

These students reported normal rather than excessive feelings of anxiety. Only a rare person can sail through a graduate school without experiencing periods of doubt, uncertainty, pain, or fright. It was from this perspective that most of the 1973 graduates discussed their experience in the accelerated program. In the remainder of this section we will try to account for the different perspective of the final group in this study. We can only speculate about the reasons accounting for their view. That their perspective was different was not known until the final group of students was interviewed. At that point we presented the problem to the 1973 graduates and asked for their thoughts.

The increase in absolute numbers of accelerated students may have made students in this group feel more secure. When the program first began, there were only 6 students. In the next two years there were about a dozen. In 1973 the number increased to 24. We suggest that both the absolute and relative number of students in a special program can affect the level of anxiety they experience. By 1973 the accelerated students had become a substantial minority. Altogether, they constituted approximately 25 percent of the 1973 graduating class. Behind them was the class of 1974, another substantial group.

At the same time that the program was growing larger it was also becoming more generally accepted. The 1973 group was following an educational track that had become clearly demarcated. They were not educational pioneers. Their anxious predecessors had blazed the trail. When they entered the program three other groups had completed the course successfully.

In time, the acceptance of the program became more widespread. A program that is five years old is no longer a fly-by-night operation. Its opponents know that it will not wither away. The 1973 graduates benefited from the general acceptance and firmer establishment of the accelerated program. They were part of a growing, flourishing program. They had reason to be proud of their status as accelerated students.

These students, more than those from previous cycles, felt themselves to be superior. They felt that they had survived a careful selective process. The benefits of the program were obvious—a shorter, less-expensive education. They were proud to have been selected. Perhaps for this reason the 1973 group was the first one to formalize their status by developing an organization comprised only of accelerated students. They held formal meetings, collected dues, and planned parties for the members. Previous groups had provided considerable support to one another. None of these, however, had developed a formal structure. This movement may disappear in future cycles if the accelerated program should become an integral part of the school and less importance is attached to being an accelerated student.

CONCLUSION

This chapter shows the importance of looking at results of a program that span more than a single year. One might have inferred from the experience of the first three cycles that students from future cycles would continue to think of themselves as second-class citizens. In retrospect, one can detect early signs that were indicative of the accelerated students' growing feeling of acceptance and strength. A few students in previous cycles had talked of their superiority. But their stance appeared to be defensive. Also, these students showed a strong group identification with each other. They seemed to huddle together for warmth and protection. We certainly would not have predicted the reaction of the 1973 group on the basis of interviews with the first three.

Students in future cycles may have reactions similar to those of 1973 as the program develops and the results of this evaluation are made known to the Adelphi community. Possibly, the solidarity among accelerated students may diminish should the program become increasingly popular. Then they might compete fiercely with one another for openings. The animosities engendered might remain long after students have entered the program. Accelerated students may come to think of themselves as a thoroughly elite group. If so, they may shun contacts with students in the traditional program.

The general point is that the accelerated program is changing and so is the Adelphi University School of Social Work. This qualitative study illustrates the response of students to a changing milieu. We make no effort to predict future directions of change. This much, however, can be said with some certainty about the past experience of accelerated students: they met the challenge resulting from their special social status. At first they felt inferior. They had doubts about accelerated education. But they proceeded to develop supports that helped them get on with the task at hand—obtaining a social work education that prepared them for practice. As objective conditions change, the students' responses will undoubtedly change as well.

NOTE

1. The summer program made heavy demands upon students. They spent four days a week at a field placement. During the 12-week session they also enrolled in two courses. Altogether they completed 14 hours of credit, including 336 hours of fieldwork.

Chapter 7

Summary and Conclusions

by Aaron Rosenblatt

Social workers have long debated the pros and cons of completing the master's degree in one year instead of two. For many years no compelling evidence was available to support a change. Consequently, the safer, more conservative position was accepted officially by the Commission on Accreditation of the Council on Social Work Education. In 1968, however, the commission modified its position and granted authority to experiment outside of standards. Consequently, programs of accelerated education were carried out at Adelphi University, the University of Wisconsin–Madison, and San Diego State College. The Social Work Training Branch of the National Institute of Mental Health recognized the significance of this breakthrough and awarded research and training grants to the three schools so that an evaluation of each program could be conducted.

A different educational design was put into operation at each of the schools. In addition, a different research design was used to evaluate the results of each program. With the completion of the Adelphi study the results of each of these programs are now available. Those interested in examining the program and study at San Diego and Wisconsin should consult Weinberger[1] and Kadushin and Kelling.[2]

The educational program that was adopted at Adelphi is described in detail in Chapter 1. Essentially it provides students interested in obtaining the master's degree in social work with an opportunity to accelerate their professional education. As undergraduate students they can elect to major in social welfare. If they do so, some courses usually available only to graduate students will be open to them. During this period they can also earn credits for their fieldwork experience. Once they receive their baccalaureate degree, a number of them are admitted to the accelerated graduate program. Initially this consists of enrollment in a summer session at the school of social work. At the completion of this program the students enter the school as second-year students.

A number of questions need to be raised in designing an evaluation study of an educational program. In Chapter 2 we dealt with these questions at length. In this summary, a few major questions are repeated because of their importance to the study. The questions are quite simple: (1) What is it that is to be the subject of study? (2) How are data of this nature to be obtained? and (3) When are such data to be obtained?

WHAT IS IT THAT IS TO BE THE SUBJECT OF STUDY?

We believe that the Adelphi University School of Social Work seeks to educate its students in accordance with certain objectives and that the curriculum reflects these objectives. From this perspective the first-order criterion for evaluating the educational program is the *learning and skill that are acquired in accordance with the objectives of the curriculum.* Examination of the Adelphi *Self-Study for Accreditation Review*[3] was used to specify the following areas of social work education in which learning and skill are to be acquired.

1. *Foundation knowledge*—(social welfare policy and services, human behavior and the social environment).
2. *Knowledge of social work practice*—(social work methods, social work research).
3. *Social work values.*
4. *Practice skills and field performance.*

HOW ARE DATA OF THIS NATURE TO BE OBTAINED?

A study is only as good as the instruments used to collect the needed information. One cannot study objectives if suitable instruments are not available for measuring them. Many a study has foundered on this rock.

On the whole, we were fortunate in our selection of instruments. Foundation knowledge was measured by two instruments, the Minnesota Inventory of Social Work Knowledge and the Study of Barry Black. The chairperson of the Human Behavior and Social Environment sequence at Adelphi believed that the latter needed to be supplemented in order to reflect all of the objectives of the sequence. She prepared 21 additional items designed to measure students' understanding of psychosocial mechanisms that affect behavior.

Increments in knowledge of social work research and attitudes toward research were measured by the MARK test devised by Harris K. Goldstein. By means of a factor analysis three dimensions were identified in the instrument: (1) knowledge of quantitative concepts and qualitative relationships and of precise differences in concepts; (2) knowledge of abstract ideas; and (3) confidence in the ability of science to solve problems.

Changes in social work values were measured by the revised version of the Social Values Test. Social work researchers have frequently made use of this. Indeed, it was used in both the San Diego and the Wisconsin studies. This test, which was developed by Henry J. Meyer in collaboration with Donna L. McLeod, taps ten value dimensions.

Practice skills and field performance were measured by the Practice Skill Assessment Instrument (PSAI). This was developed under the direction of Rosemary C. Sarri at the University of Michigan School of Social Work and is able to discriminate between the work of "A" and "B" students and the work of first- and fourth-semester students.

We sought to validate the use of these instruments by examining differences in combined scores of accelerated and traditional students between the start and the completion of their education. We reasoned that instruments able to show increments in learning and in skill were suitable for use in this study. If we could demonstrate that they were capable of registering significant change, the validity of the evaluation would be enhanced. When an instrument does not register change from one period to another, one cannot assume that the instrument is defective. Increments in learning or in skill may not be registered simply because no substantial degree of learning has occurred. Nevertheless, instruments that register an increase from the start to the completion of an educational program have a compelling quality about them.

The Inventory of Social Work Knowledge scores of all students, accelerated and traditional, were considerably different between the start and the completion of their education. The results of t-tests for correlated samples for all sections of the inventory reached the predetermined .05 level of statistical significance. Differences in before-and-after scores of the Study of Barry Black, although generally much weaker than those of the inventory, nonetheless reached the .05 level of statistical significance for the total test. The scores of the MARK test showed an increase in unfavorable attitudes toward research. Nonetheless the students showed statistically significant increases in the extent of their knowledge of research.

The before-and-after scores of the Social Values test were lower than had been expected. For eight of the ten dimensions the differences from the start to the completion of education were not statistically significant. There was relatively little positive change noted between the start and the completion of the students' education. The results of this test have been reported but they were not used to evaluate the educational experiment at Adelphi.

Differences in the before-and-after ratings for the PSAI were strong and consistent. The consistently higher "after" ratings indicated that this instrument was capable of registering change in fieldwork performance.

In summary, there is still room for much improvement in the instruments available for measuring change in the acquisition of knowledge, values, and skill related to the formal objectives of social work education. Still, the instruments used in this study proved to be serviceable. All of them with the exception of the Social Values Test showed significant differences between the start and the completion of the students' formal social work education.

WHEN ARE SUCH DATA TO BE OBTAINED?

Because we sought to measure the acquisition of knowledge, values, and skill during the course of the accelerated and traditional programs, we decided to make use of a before-and-after research design. An after only study would not provide information on the amount of change that took place from the start to the completion of the students' formal education. Before and after measures were needed in order to make appropriate interpretations about the changes that occurred. The interpretation of after only measures is, of course, extremely hazardous.

We also favored a before-and-after panel design for another reason. We did not wish to assume that the goals of education were being reached simply because there were classrooms, teachers, students, and textbooks proclaiming the presence of an educational enterprise. If philosophers accepted evidence of this kind, they would have proved the existence of God long ago by the presence of cathedrals, ministers, congregations, and reports of answered prayers.

At the suggestion of an NIMH consultant the research design was expanded to include the practice of students one year after they had graduated. It was believed that changes in accelerated and traditional students might continue to occur after they had graduated. In other words, the different programs might have a differential impact on practice that would become manifest only after a sufficient passage of time.

One additional part of the study needs to be mentioned before we can proceed to its actual conduct and the presentation of the findings. Some prominent social work educators expressed considerable concern that students attracted to accelerated programs would be tainted by a heavily vocational orientation. They wanted social workers to obtain a strong liberal arts background before entering graduate school. Today the value of this part of the study seems marginal. Initially we believed that the question had more merit, but times have changed and so have we. Some readers may still consider that this part of the study is important and that the findings bearing upon this issue are valuable.

In summary, the evaluation study of the accelerated and traditional programs at Adelphi was designed to answer these three broad questions:

1. Did accelerated and traditional students differ in the amount of formal

learning they acquired during their training?

2. Did accelerated and traditional students differ in their practice one year after graduation?
3. Were there differences in the educational background of students enrolled in the accelerated and traditional programs?

COMPARISON OF LEARNING SCORES

Chapters 4 and 5 contained detailed information about the answers to the above questions. In this final chapter we wish to highlight the findings. Therefore we will limit the presentation of data by following these procedures: we will report on the findings only for each of the cycles and for all three cycles combined. Also we will report only on findings that compare the learning scores of accelerated and traditional students and on the differences between both groups at the completion of their training.

Inventory of Social Work Knowledge

The learning scores of accelerated students were higher in the Inventory of Social Work Knowledge test for Cycles II and IV. For both of these cycles, the differences in learning were statistically significant. The learning scores of accelerated students were also higher when all sections of the test and all three cycles were combined. Furthermore, this overall difference was statistically significant.

Barry Black Test

The Barry Black test is divided into two sets of items. The first set comprises items from the standard form of the test. For Cycles II and IV the learning scores of traditional students were higher; for Cycle III the scores of accelerated students were higher. None of the differences for all cycles was statistically significant. When all three cycles were combined, traditional students scored slightly higher, but not significantly so.

The second group of items was especially designed for Adelphi students. None of the differences in learning was statistically significant for these items on any of the cycles or on the combination of the three cycles. Furthermore no discernible trend favored either group of students.

Differences between the absolute scores of accelerated and traditional students were not statistically significant at the end of their training. In conclusion, the learning scores and the end of training scores were similar for both groups.

Measurement of Attitude and Research Knowledge

Differences in learning were quite small between accelerated and traditional students for each of the three cycles and for all three cycles combined on the MARK test. None of the differences was statistically significant. At the end of their training there was no essential difference between the two groups.

Social Work Values Test

The Social Work Values Test was the only one of the instruments that failed to show a statistically significant difference between the scores of all students from the start to the completion of their education and training. Therefore the results of this test were not used in evaluating the accelerated program.

The findings of the Social Work Values Test were presented in Chapter 4 because of their general interest to social workers. It does not seem appropriate to include these findings in this final section of the report. Although student values may show some turnover, there was no consistent change in social work values. Therefore, we reasoned there was little point in measuring something that was not changing and then using this information to evaluate the accelerated program. The significance of these findings has more importance for curriculum development than for this evaluation.

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument

A total of 57 items was used in evaluating practice skills of social work students. Rather than give information on each of these items a general summary is presented.

The practice ratings for both accelerated and traditional students showed positive change on all items from the start to the completion of their training. Generally, more improvement was shown in the ratings of accelerated students. For individual items in each cycle these differences were rarely statistically significant. When the four cycles were combined and the number of students examined was much larger, the differences in improvement were more likely to be statistically significant.

At the start of fieldwork practice accelerated students performed at a decidedly lower level than traditional students. The improvement shown by accelerated students was much greater, so that by the end of training they had caught up with traditional students. Thus accelerated students generally overcame the initial advantage of traditional students. For 55 of 57 items differences in practice ratings were not statistically significant at the completion of training.

In summary, *on the basis of the before-and-after scores of accelerated and traditional students, one must conclude that the accelerated program was accomplishing its goals in the training of social work students.*

PRACTICE FINDINGS ONE YEAR AFTER GRADUATION

The items used to examine practice skill one year after graduation were somewhat different from those used in the PSAI. The wording was changed to reflect the new status of students as graduate social workers. Also, it seemed appropriate to drop a few items and add three new ones. Save for these few exceptions the instrument was essentially the same as the PSAI.

The ratings of accelerated and traditional students showed a consistent trend after they had been in practice for one year. For most of the items the differences between the two groups were generally small. Of the 53 items only 3 showed statistically significant differences. If the level of analysis was limited to an item-by-item examination, the difference in the ratings of both groups of students generally was not statistically significant.

A different view was obtained when the overall pattern of the items was examined. When we directed our attention to the general pattern, we observed small, consistent differences in the two groups of students. For example, we divided all of the 106 average ratings for accelerated and traditional students into two groups, one above and one below the median. Of the 53 ratings above the median, 37 or 70 percent were those of traditional students. This trend was strong and consistent and should not be overlooked because it did not appear in an item-by-item analysis.

In summary, *the ratings of traditional students were consistently higher one year after graduation. The differences, however, were of a small magnitude. The average of the average differences separating the two groups was 0.23. In our judgment this was not large enough to raise serious doubt about the value of accelerated education. Yet the overall trend was consistent enough to merit further inquiry.*

INITIAL DIFFERENCES IN ACADEMIC BACKGROUND

Three measures were used to examine the academic background of students: (1) scores on the Graduate Record Examination (GRE); (2) the undergraduate Quality Point Average (QPA) of students; and (3) undergraduate transcripts of courses in the social and behavioral sciences.

Graduate Record Examination

For men the scores of traditional students were higher than those of accelerated students. The difference was 83 points on the verbal score and 62 on the quantitative score. Both differences favored traditional students. The scores of women were much closer, although in both instances those of traditional students were higher. The difference on the verbal was 45 points and on the quantitative, only 7 points. In short, for both men and women the verbal and quantitative scores were higher for traditional students.

Quality Point Average

The quality point average was 3.41 for accelerated students and 2.73 for traditional students. These results were not consistent with those obtained from the GRE. The QPA of accelerated students was much higher than that of traditional students.

It is possible to reconcile these differences by making the following assumption: students who obtain high grades in a professionally oriented curriculum need not always acquire more information. Obtaining high grades is a "practical art" that is not always correlated with the ability to store information.

Transcripts of Undergraduate Courses

Accelerated and traditional students completed a similar number of courses as undergraduates. The accelerated students completed a mean of 12.0 courses in the social and behavioral sciences in comparison to 12.2 courses for traditional students, a negligible difference over a four-year period.

In our view, the differences in GRE scores, the QPA, and the number of undergraduate courses completed in the social and behavioral sciences were of limited importance. Those who wish to make a case against the accelerated program can point to the GRE scores of men, where the scores of the 11 accelerated students were much lower than those of the 22 traditional students as well as those of both groups of women. This finding bears further exploration. Additional study of these two measures is needed since they are so widely used in screening candidates for admission to graduate programs. Some further effort should be made to account for the considerably higher QPA of accelerated students. While these matters are of interest, in our judgment they are of secondary importance. Of far greater importance is the knowledge and skill that students acquire in their social work training. On the basis of the information reported in this section, we believe that Adelphi is justified in continuing the accelerated program of social work education.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

A word needs to be said about the educational model that was tested at Adelphi. After receiving their baccalaureate degree, the accelerated students took part in an intensive summer program. They spent four days a week at their fieldwork agencies. By their own admission they used this experience to catch up with traditional students. The accelerated students' analysis of the program seemed accurate, although no empirical data were available to support this view. The "before" scores of the PSAI, however, clearly indicated that they were less capable than traditional students at the start of their training. The combination of the intensive summer experience and a second-year placement equal to that of traditional students erased the initial differences that had existed in their fieldwork performance. The accelerated students did, indeed, catch up to the traditional students.

What are the implications of this model for the future of social work education? Should all schools wishing to accelerate their graduate program be required to develop modifications in accordance with this model? That is one possible interpretation of the findings.

But some schools may prefer to adopt a different model, since the Adelphi model is rather conservative. It eliminates only one of the four terms that comprise graduate education. After all, the summer program is approximately equal to one term of graduate education in cost and in credits earned.[4]

Some schools may prefer to adopt the model that was used at Wisconsin. There, accelerated students who were seniors entered the first-year program of the graduate school. They enrolled in the same courses as did traditional students, and their fieldwork experience was identical. Accordingly, they did not suffer from feeling like second-class students, as did the Adelphi students. The Wisconsin model has much to recommend it. Which is preferable?

From the research studies completed, there is no way of knowing whether one educational model produces better results than the other. Different research designs were used to evaluate the two models and different instruments were used to obtain data. Furthermore, the students and the instruction they received may not have been comparable. For all of these reasons one cannot compare the results of the two programs. Under these circumstances schools wishing to introduce an accelerated program should be free to select whichever model seems preferable.

The choice can be influenced by such practical matters as the university regulations governing the admission of students to graduate schools. Adelphi University requires a bachelor's degree as a basis for admission to graduate school. This affected the development of the Adelphi model. Before the study was begun, there was considerable discussion about different educational models. The Wisconsin model was rejected for practical rather than intellectual reasons. In retrospect the university's decision resulted in some positive consequences for social work education, since two models were studied instead of one. Now there is a choice available to social work educators.

The Council on Social Work Education and the National Institute of Mental Health gave the researchers at the three schools great leeway in choosing how to conduct their evaluative studies. This freedom was greatly appreciated. One minor modification that NIMH requested was that the initial Adelphi research design be expanded to include a one-year-after follow-up of students. Another useful suggestion was that data be collected about students' experiences in the accelerated program. In effect the officials of these organizations said: "Do the job in the best way possible."

And yet one must ask whether the three studies might not have had a greater impact on social work education if there had been greater similarity in the research designs. If the same design had been followed and the same instruments used, comparable information now would be available about the effect of the various models. We would be in a better position to know if one model produced better results than another.

It is easy to make such a suggestion now that all of the studies have been completed. If this hindsight suggestion had been adopted earlier a sticky problem might have arisen. The record shows that the researchers selected different research designs and different research instruments. If a coordinated research program would have been followed, it would have been necessary to resolve these differences. Some formal mechanism would have been necessary to settle the issues at hand and the researchers would have had to surrender some of their independence. Yet these limitations may have been worthwhile in view of the question that still remains unanswered.

The social work profession should give thanks to the Council on Social Work Education and the Social Work Training Branch of the National Institute of Mental Health. As a result of their interest and support the profession now has empirical findings available that can be used in shaping the future form of social work education. Textbooks traditionally extoll the value of policy research. Rarely are such studies funded. Even more rarely are the results of policy studies heeded. Today the form and length of social work education are hotly debated issues. Pertinent data are available. Let us hope that policy makers will consult these studies.

In this final, closing paragraph we present a summary of the seven-year program. We tried to conduct a careful study of the accelerated program of social work education at Adelphi. We pretested students in one cycle and tested those in three successive cycles. The accelerated students were younger and less experienced than the traditional students. They acquired more general knowledge and their practice ratings improved more. At the end of their training these improvements did not distinguish them from traditional students since they started from a generally lower base. Perhaps the most serious charge that can be brought against the accelerated program stems from the findings on student practice one year after graduation. These differences were small on an item-by-item analysis of practice, but the overall pattern was clear: the ratings of traditional students were higher. Nonetheless, the magnitude of difference was relatively small. On the basis of all the evidence obtained, we recommend the continuation of the accelerated program.

NOTES

1. Paul Weinberger, "The Undergraduate Continuum Project: A Final Report," mimeographed (San Diego: School of Social Work, San Diego State University, 1972).

2. Alfred Kadushin and George Kelling, "Final Report: An Innovative Program in Social

Work Education, the 3-2 Program," mimeographed (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin School of Social Work, 1973).

3. *Self-Study for Accreditation Review*, Vol. 1 (Garden City, N.Y.: Adelphi University School of Social Work, 1965).

4. In 1973, on the basis of earlier findings from the experimental research, the Adelphi University School of Social Work modified the educational model of the continuum by eliminating the summer program and enriching the professional content of the junior year by an equivalent number of credits (10).

Appendix

TABLE 4-1

Inventory of Social Work Knowledge: History and Philosophy

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	13.08	5.62	12	13.17	3.79	12	.08	5.32
	Traditional	14	11.57	3.78	14	14.93	2.89	14	3.36	3.88
	t-Test Value		0.7830			−1.2900			−1.7393	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	11.18	2.86	11	12.27	3.47	11	1.09	1.70
	Traditional	16	12.12	4.96	16	14.94	4.78	16	2.82	2.97
	t-Test Value		−0.5472			−1.5244			−1.6706	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	9.96	3.92	24	13.25	2.80	24	3.29	3.75
	Traditional	31	10.00	3.81	31	13.81	3.89	31	3.81	3.70
	t-Test Value		−0.0396			−0.6168			−0.5080	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	11.04	4.32	47	13.00	3.18	47	1.96	4.05
	Traditional	61	10.92	4.18	61	14.36	3.92	61	3.44	3.53
	t-Test Value		0.1506			−1.9889			−1.9948	
	Probability		ns			<.05			<.05	

TABLE 4-2
Inventory of Social Work Knowledge: Social Policies and Issues

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	12	4.33	2.90	12	6.42	1.68	12	2.08	2.54
	Traditional	14	4.86	2.14	14	7.36	1.82	14	2.50	1.74
	t-Test Value		−0.5072			−1.3072			−0.4739	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	5.18	1.40	11	5.18	1.60	11	0.00	2.05
	Traditional	16	5.56	2.50	16	7.00	1.59	16	1.44	2.36
	t-Test Value		−0.4403			−2.7996			−1.5751	
	Probability		ns			<.05			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	3.88	2.09	24	5.67	1.93	24	1.79	2.04
	Traditional	31	3.84	2.12	31	5.65	1.76	31	1.81	1.92
	t-Test Value		0.0635			0.0426			−0.0273	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	4.30	2.22	47	5.74	1.81	47	1.44	2.28
	Traditional	61	4.52	2.31	61	6.39	1.87	61	1.87	2.01
	t-Test Value		−0.5171			−1.8180			−1.0026	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-3

Inventory of Social Work Knowledge: Social Security and Social Welfare

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	12	[illegible].83	2.86	12	10.83	2.48	12	3.00	3.93
	Traditional	14	10.71	3.47	14	12.14	3.08	14	1.43	3.88
	t-Test Value		−2.1967			−1.1333			0.9835	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	8.45	2.88	11	9.91	1.87	11	1.46	3.21
	Traditional	16	9.81	3.60	16	12.94	2.14	16	3.13	3.36
	t-Test Value		−1.0035			−3.6541			−1.2435	
	Probability		ns			<.05			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	7.17	3.34	24	10.96	2.18	24	3.79	3.36
	Traditional	31	9.03	2.70	31	10.32	2.29	31	1.29	2.58
	t-Test Value		−2.2272			1.0509			3.0191	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	7.64	3.10	47	10.68	2.19	47	3.04	3.53
	Traditional	61	9.62	3.16	61	11.43	2.68	61	1.81	3.17
	t-Test Value		−3.2702			−1.5906			1.8890	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-4
Inventory of Social Work Knowledge: Fields of Social Work

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	12	9.58	3.45	12	12.50	3.48	12	2.92	2.50
	Traditional	14	11.71	2.78	14	13.14	2.25	14	1.43	2.59
	t-Test Value		−1.6735			−0.5449			1.4241	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	10.64	4.15	11	11.55	2.38	11	.91	3.42
	Traditional	16	11.62	3.18	16	12.25	2.49	16	.63	3.38
	t-Test Value		−0.6730			−0.7075			0.2054	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	9.08	3.12	24	12.83	2.41	24	3.75	3.38
	Traditional	31	10.42	3.41	31	12.42	2.81	31	2.00	2.83
	t-Test Value		−1.5114			0.5872			2.0432	
	Probability		ns			ns			<.05	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	9.57	3.44	47	12.45	2.70	47	2.88	3.33
	Traditional	61	11.03	3.23	61	12.54	2.59	61	1.51	2.94
	t-Test Value		−2.2414			−0.1828			2.2205	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-5
Inventory of Social Work Knowledge: Profession of Social Work

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	12	9.75	5.08	12	12.67	2.53	12	2.92	5.66
	Traditional	14	13.21	2.67	14	13.64	1.69	14	.43	2.31
	t-Test Value		−2.1317			−1.1231			1.4450	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	11.09	4.06	11	11.91	1.38	11	.82	3.40
	Traditional	16	12.69	3.48	16	12.88	2.00	16	.19	2.81
	t-Test Value		−1.0526			−1.3411			0.5056	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	11.58	3.17	24	13.62	2.41	24	2.04	4.02
	Traditional	31	12.23	3.16	31	13.48	2.79	31	1.25	2.78
	t-Test Value		−0.7459			0.2009			0.8163	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	11.00	3.92	47	12.98	2.32	47	1.98	4.34
	Traditional	61	12.57	3.12	61	13.36	2.37	61	.79	2.69
	t-Test Value		−2.2558			−0.8414			1.6548	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-6
Inventory of Social Work Knowledge: Practice of Social Work

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	12	13.83	10.34	12	25.67	4.27	12	11.83	11.87
	Traditional	14	24.07	3.83	14	25.50	4.85	14	1.43	5.47
	t-Test Value		−3.3050			0.0887			2.8208	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	
III	Accelerated	11	24.18	6.90	11	27.27	5.12	11	3.09	5.75
	Traditional	16	23.06	8.20	16	26.62	3.07	16	3.56	6.52
	t-Test Value		0.3573			0.3944			−0.1863	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	23.25	3.71	24	27.12	2.17	24	3.87	3.96
	Traditional	31	24.55	5.04	31	25.84	4.65	31	1.29	3.84
	t-Test Value		−1.0995			1.3606			2.4325	
	Probability		ns			ns			<.05	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	21.06	7.83	47	26.79	3.59	47	5.73	7.87
	Traditional	61	24.05	5.75	61	25.97	4.29	61	1.92	5.05
	t-Test Value		−2.1974			1.0805			2.8893	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-7
Inventory of Social Work Knowledge: Total Score

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	58.42	16.67	12	81.25	11.94	12	22.83	14.78
	Traditional	14	76.14	13.61	14	86.64	11.82	14	10.50	9.70
	t-Test Value		−2.8671			−1.1092			2.4469	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	
III	Accelerated	11	70.73	16.55	11	78.09	9.39	11	7.36	12.31
	Traditional	16	74.88	20.24	16	86.62	11.03	16	11.74	13.42
	t-Test Value		−0.5413			−2.0173			−0.8302	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	64.50	14.08	24	83.46	8.54	24	18.96	13.32
	Traditional	31	70.06	12.96	31	81.52	13.32	31	11.46	8.31
	t-Test Value		−1.5049			0.6560			2.4200	
	Probability		ns			ns			<.05	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	64.40	15.62	47	81.64	9.72	47	17.24	14.39
	Traditional	61	72.72	15.30	61	84.03	12.49	61	11.31	10.01
	t-Test Value		−2.7678			−1.1201			2.4087	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-8
A Study of Barry Black—Part I: Diagnostic Section

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	77.50	13.59	12	78.00	9.90	12	.50	12.16
	Traditional	14	71.78	9.50	14	76.50	10.91	14	4.71	13.05
	t-Test Value		1.2062			0.3504			−0.8137	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	69.82	12.25	11	74.18	12.54	11	4.36	11.17
	Traditional	16	78.69	12.66	16	76.56	14.05	16	2.13	7.61
	t-Test Value		−1.7431			−0.4348			1.7275	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	74.17	12.08	24	78.58	9.73	24	4.41	16.34
	Traditional	31	71.58	10.75	31	78.06	11.52	31	6.48	10.29
	t-Test Value		0.8254			0.1810			−0.5420	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	74.00	12.54	47	77.40	10.40	47	3.40	14.11
	Traditional	61	73.49	11.28	61	77.31	11.92	61	3.82	10.84
	t-Test Value		0.2181			0.0431			−0.1673	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-9
A Study of Barry Black—Part II: Treatment Section

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	12	64.17	5.81	12	67.50	5.28	12	3.33	6.51
	Traditional	14	66.21	9.01	14	66.29	7.17	14	.08	7.85
	t-Test Value		−0.6491			0.4655			1.0968	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	62.82	8.28	11	65.09	7.15	11	2.27	8.00
	Traditional	16	63.94	6.77	16	65.19	3.17	16	1.25	6.65
	t-Test Value		−0.3706			−0.0459			0.3475	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	66.96	6.95	24	65.88	6.10	24	1.08	7.01
	Traditional	31	63.06	6.71	31	63.61	6.85	31	.55	5.89
	t-Test Value		2.0921			1.2921			−0.9169	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	65.28	7.10	47	66.11	6.10	47	.83	7.26
	Traditional	61	64.02	7.29	61	64.64	6.19	61	.62	6.48
	t-Test Value		0.9040			1.2311			0.1538	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-10
A Study of Barry Black—Total Score

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	12	141.67	14.59	12	145.50	14.12	12	3.83	10.99
	Traditional	14	138.00	13.59	14	142.79	12.53	14	4.79	14.57
	t-Test Value		0.6369			0.4988			−0.1784	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	132.64	17.90	11	139.27	15.29	11	6.63	15.99
	Traditional	16	142.62	18.39	16	141.75	14.96	16	−0.87	10.75
	t-Test Value		−1.3490			−0.4031			1.4044	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	141.12	13.99	24	144.46	12.98	24	3.34	17.69
	Traditional	31	134.65	13.60	31	141.68	13.54	31	7.03	10.26
	t-Test Value		1.7247			0.7732			−0.9124	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	139.28	15.24	47	143.51	13.73	47	4.23	15.58
	Traditional	61	137.51	15.11	61	141.95	13.49	61	4.44	11.77
	t-Test Value		0.6001			0.5898			−0.0765	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-11
A Study of Barry Black—Psychosocial Dynamics: Supplementary Items (Specific)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	1.42	.90	12	1.83	.72	12	.42	1.44
	Traditional	14	1.50	1.02	14	1.57	.51	14	.07	.99
	t-Test Value		−0.2107			1.0379			0.6891	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	1.82	.98	11	1.82	1.17	11	.00	1.48
	Traditional	16	1.19	.75	16	2.00	.97	16	.81	1.11
	t-Test Value		1.8186			−0.4242			−1.5660	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	1.38	1.13	24	1.46	.83	24	.08	1.35
	Traditional	31	1.42	1.12	31	1.90	.91	31	.48	1.21
	t-Test Value		−0.1446			−1.8888			−1.1429	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	1.49	1.04	47	1.64	.90	47	.15	1.38
	Traditional	61	1.38	1.00	61	1.85	.85	61	.47	1.15
	t-Test Value		0.5652			−1.2581			−1.3077	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-12
A Study of Barry Black—Psychosocial Dynamics: Supplementary Items (General)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education N	Start of Social Work Education Mean	Start of Social Work Education Standard Deviation	Completion of Social Work Education N	Completion of Social Work Education Mean	Completion of Social Work Education Standard Deviation	t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning N	t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning Mean	t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	12	8.08	3.23	12	11.42	1.38	12	3.33	2.84
	Traditional	14	8.86	1.83	14	11.57	1.22	14	2.71	1.74
	t-Test Value		−0.7338			−0.2914			0.6549	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	9.64	1.43	11	10.36	1.96	11	.73	2.45
	Traditional	16	10.19	1.52	16	11.44	1.90	16	1.25	2.18
	t-Test Value		−0.9134			−1.3713			−0.5601	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	9.38	2.10	24	11.17	1.49	24	1.79	1.84
	Traditional	31	10.52	2.35	31	11.39	1.86	31	.87	1.89
	t-Test Value		−1.8958			−0.4879			1.8168	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	9.11	2.35	47	11.04	1.60	47	1.93	2.41
	Traditional	61	10.05	2.12	61	11.44	1.72	61	1.39	2.04
	t-Test Value		−2.1533			−1.2471			1.2390	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-13

Measurement of Attitudes and Research Knowledge—Attitudes

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	12	9.25	1.96	12	8.92	1.78	12	−0.33	1.44
	Traditional	14	8.79	2.26	14	8.71	2.23	14	−0.07	2.20
	t-Test Value		0.5333			0.2426			−0.3391	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	8.27	2.33	11	8.00	1.84	11	−0.27	2.65
	Traditional	16	8.81	2.07	16	8.94	1.98	16	.13	2.31
	t-Test Value		−0.6083			−1.1952			−0.3986	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	9.50	1.67	24	9.08	1.53	24	−0.42	2.21
	Traditional	31	9.61	2.26	31	8.48	1.95	31	−1.13	2.25
	t-Test Value		−0.2130			1.2786			1.1783	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	9.15	1.93	47	8.79	1.69	47	−0.36	2.11
	Traditional	61	9.21	2.21	61	8.66	2.00	61	−0.55	2.29
	t-Test Value		−0.1605			0.3697			0.4602	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-14

Measurement of Attitudes and Research Knowledge—Attitudes and Knowledge

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	2.42	1.16	12	2.64	0.92	12	.22	1.42
	Traditional	14	2.50	1.56	14	2.57	1.09	14	.07	1.21
	t-Test Value		−0.1465			−0.3359			0.3672	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	2.91	1.22	11	2.55	0.52	11	−.36	1.27
	Traditional	16	2.94	1.44	16	3.06	1.12	16	.12	1.26
	t-Test Value		−0.516			−1.3703			−0.9454	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	2.58	0.78	24	2.58	1.28	24	.00	1.41
	Traditional	31	3.10	1.33	31	2.48	1.15	31	−.62	1.23
	t-Test Value		−1.7959			0.2982			1.6863	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	2.62	0.99	47	2.59	1.05	47	−.03	1.37
	Traditional	61	2.92	1.41	61	2.66	1.14	61	−.26	1.26
	t-Test Value		−1.3043			−0.3243			0.9278	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-15

Measurement of Attitudes and Research Knowledge—Knowledge

Cycle	*Students*	*Start of Social Work Education*			*Completion of Social Work Education*			*t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning*		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	15.75	5.28	12	17.42	3.55	12	1.67	4.70
	Traditional	14	15.64	5.97	14	16.36	6.42	14	.71	4.34
	t-Test Value		0.0462			0.4890			0.5159	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	15.36	5.12	11	16.27	4.58	11	.91	3.08
	Traditional	16	17.94	6.73	16	19.44	6.75	16	1.50	2.42
	t-Test Value		−1.0323			−1.3034			−0.5357	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	13.88	4.67	24	16.25	4.26	24	2.37	4.57
	Traditional	31	16.03	6.54	31	18.71	5.39	31	2.68	4.15
	t-Test Value		−1.4260			−1.8918			−0.2534	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	14.70	4.90	47	16.55	4.11	47	1.85	4.26
	Traditional	61	16.44	6.43	61	18.36	6.01	61	1.92	3.85
	t-Test Value		−1.5973			−1.8524			−0.0844	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-16
Measurement of Attitudes and Research Knowledge—Total Score

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	12	27.42	6.29	12	28.67	4.96	12	1.25	5.41
	Traditional	14	26.93	6.58	14	27.64	7.50	14	.71	6.80
	t-Test Value		0.1849			0.3875			0.2111	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	26.55	6.85	11	26.82	5.55	11	.27	4.27
	Traditional	16	29.69	7.83	16	31.44	7.55	16	1.75	3.21
	t-Test Value		−1.0369			−1.6670			−0.9861	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	25.96	4.74	24	27.92	4.99	24	1.96	5.52
	Traditional	31	28.77	8.66	31	29.68	6.46	31	.91	5.34
	t-Test Value		−1.5368			−1.1411			0.7128	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	26.47	5.59	47	27.85	5.04	47	1.38	5.16
	Traditional	61	28.59	7.95	61	29.67	7.01	61	1.08	5.20
	t-Test Value		−1.6270			−1.5697			0.2994	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-17

Social Work Values Test—Public Aid vs. Private Effort

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	15.00	1.76	12	14.50	1.88	12	−0.50	2.35
	Traditional	14	14.64	1.78	14	14.92	1.69	14	0.29	2.37
	t-Test Value		0.4927			−0.5882			−0.8125	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	14.27	2.84	11	14.36	1.91	11	.09	1.76
	Traditional	16	14.00	2.85	16	13.75	1.77	16	−0.25	2.62
	t-Test Value		0.2542			0.8242			0.3628	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	14.46	1.38	24	14.58	1.53	24	.12	1.23
	Traditional	31	14.23	1.48	31	14.55	1.71	31	.32	1.70
	t-Test Value		0.6004			0.0798			−0.5002	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	14.55	1.70	47	14.51	1.68	47	−0.04	1.68
	Traditional	61	14.26	1.97	61	14.43	1.75	61	.16	2.11
	t-Test Value		0.8223			0.2545			−0.5665	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-18
Social Work Values Test—Personal Freedom vs. Societal Control

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	12	11.08	2.35	12	11.33	2.96	12	.25	3.67
	Traditional	14	11.43	2.31	14	12.00	2.75	14	.57	2.31
	t-Test Value		−0.3618			−0.5715			−0.2603	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	12.91	1.87	11	12.09	1.58	11	−0.82	2.48
	Traditional	16	12.38	2.85	16	11.94	1.88	16	−0.44	2.56
	t-Test Value		0.5256			0.2138			−0.3703	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	12.33	5.45	24	11.71	2.14	24	−0.62	2.55
	Traditional	31	11.97	2.58	31	11.55	2.62	31	−0.42	2.14
	t-Test Value		0.5505			0.2494			−0.3177	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	12.15	2.29	47	11.70	2.24	47	−0.45	2.83
	Traditional	61	11.95	2.57	61	11.75	2.45	61	−0.20	2.29
	t-Test Value		0.4221			−0.1149			−0.4940	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-19
Social Work Values Test—Personal Goals vs. Maintenance of Group

Cycle	*Students*	*Start of Social Work Education*			*Completion of Social Work Education*			*t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning*		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	10.58	2.35	12	12.00	1.65	12	1.42	1.93
	Traditional	14	10.57	1.83	14	11.79	.89	14	1.21	1.81
	t-Test Value		0.0139			0.4028			0.2653	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	11.82	2.93	11	11.73	2.00	11	−0.09	2.21
	Traditional	16	11.81	2.07	16	11.56	1.50	16	−0.25	2.79
	t-Test Value		0.0057			0.2346			0.1520	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	11.75	1.75	24	12.25	2.13	24	.50	2.43
	Traditional	31	11.71	1.53	31	11.61	1.63	31	−0.10	1.60
	t-Test Value		0.0894			1.2157			1.0406	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	11.47	2.23	47	12.06	1.96	47	.59	2.28
	Traditional	61	11.48	1.79	61	11.64	1.44	61	.16	2.07
	t-Test Value		−0.0184			1.2481			1.0157	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-20
Social Work Values Test—Social Causation vs. Individual Autonomy

Cycle	Students	*Start of Social Work Education*			*Completion of Social Work Education*			*t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning*		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	13.83	1.59	12	14.50	1.88	12	.67	1.61
	Traditional	14	13.21	1.71	14	14.29	1.54	14	1.07	2.06
	t-Test Value		0.9118			0.3065			−0.5301	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	13.27	2.45	11	13.55	1.69	11	.28	1.79
	Traditional	16	13.94	1.77	16	13.12	1.89	16	−0.82	2.01
	t-Test Value		−0.7870			0.5692			1.3863	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	13.79	1.82	24	13.58	1.61	24	−0.21	1.67
	Traditional	31	12.87	2.28	31	13.10	1.81	31	.23	2.17
	t-Test Value		1.6677			1.0505			−0.8387	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	13.68	1.90	47	13.81	1.71	47	.13	1.69
	Traditional	61	13.23	2.05	61	12.38	1.82	61	.15	2.17
	t-Test Value		1.1814			1.2627			−0.0535	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-21
Social Work Values Test—Pluralism vs. Homogeneity

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	14.33	1.87	12	14.08	2.35	12	−0.25	1.66
	Traditional	14	13.21	2.39	14	14.36	1.39	14	1.14	2.48
	t-Test Value		1.2603			−0.3524			−1.5911	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	14.18	2.13	11	12.82	1.83	11	−1.36	1.75
	Traditional	16	14.50	1.46	16	13.25	2.21	16	−1.25	1.98
	t-Test Value		−0.4423			−0.5143			−0.1476	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	14.38	1.91	24	13.58	1.53	24	−0.80	1.91
	Traditional	31	14.16	1.59	31	13.61	1.80	31	−0.55	2.01
	t-Test Value		0.4423			−0.0658			−0.4574	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	14.32	1.91	47	13.53	1.85	47	−0.79	1.82
	Traditional	61	14.03	1.81	61	13.69	1.85	61	−0.34	2.26
	t-Test Value		0.7902			−0.4361			−1.1296	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-22
Social Work Values Test—Secularism vs. Religiosity

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	13.83	2.59	12	15.33	1.37	12	1.50	1.57
	Traditional	14	14.14	2.71	14	14.43	1.79	14	.29	2.05
	t-Test Value		−0.2846			1.3748			1.6071	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	15.00	1.18	11	14.55	1.44	11	−0.45	1.57
	Traditional	16	13.88	2.92	16	14.19	2.29	16	.31	1.35
	t-Test Value		1.1661			0.4429			−1.3031	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	14.42	1.69	24	14.42	1.74	24	0.00	1.79
	Traditional	31	13.97	2.06	31	14.03	2.30	31	.06	1.63
	t-Test Value		0.8876			0.7048			−0.1376	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	14.40	1.87	47	14.68	1.60	47	.28	1.82
	Traditional	61	13.98	2.42	61	14.16	2.16	61	.18	1.65
	t-Test Value		1.0187			1.4267			0.2844	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-23
Social Work Values Test—Self-Determinism vs. Fatalism

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	11.75	1.48	12	12.33	1.56	12	.58	1.68
	Traditional	14	12.29	1.54	14	12.00	1.18	14	−0.29	.99
	t-Test Value		−0.8635			0.5962			1.5690	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	12.00	1.34	11	12.00	1.41	11	0.00	1.95
	Traditional	16	12.44	1.15	16	11.69	1.30	16	−0.75	1.39
	t-Test Value		−0.8715			0.5691			1.1226	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	12.38	1.47	24	12.38	1.44	24	0.00	1.79
	Traditional	31	12.10	1.37	31	12.48	1.59	31	.38	1.82
	t-Test Value		0.7163			−0.2658			−0.7887	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	12.13	1.44	47	12.28	1.44	47	.15	1.78
	Traditional	61	12.23	1.35	61	12.16	1.45	61	−0.07	1.61
	t-Test Value		−0.3750			0.4017			0.6466	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-24

Social Work Values Test—Positive Satisfaction vs. Struggle-Denial

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	12.42	2.54	12	13.67	2.46	12	1.25	1.91
	Traditional	14	12.07	2.30	14	12.57	2.90	14	.50	3.92
	t-Test Value		0.3492			0.9880			0.5806	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	12.82	2.82	11	13.00	2.05	11	.18	2.68
	Traditional	16	11.62	2.68	16	11.81	2.07	16	.19	2.32
	t-Test Value		1.0703			1.4140			−0.0057	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	12.46	2.36	24	12.33	2.22	24	−0.13	1.96
	Traditional	31	11.74	2.52	31	11.71	2.02	31	−0.03	2.02
	t-Test Value		1.0849			1.0744			−0.1714	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	12.53	2.47	47	12.83	2.27	47	.30	2.17
	Traditional	61	11.79	2.48	61	11.93	2.25	61	.14	2.60
	t-Test Value		1.5536			2.0410			0.3275	
	Probability		ns			<.05			ns	

TABLE 4-25
Social Work Values Test—Social Protection vs. Social Retribution

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	14.25	1.81	12	14.25	2.18	12	0.00	2.04
	Traditional	14	12.64	1.95	14	12.93	2.06	14	.29	2.33
	t-Test Value		2.0804			1.5269			−0.3164	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	14.73	1.49	11	13.36	2.54	11	−1.37	1.96
	Traditional	16	13.38	2.13	16	12.69	1.74	16	−0.69	2.50
	t-Test Value		1.7558			0.7897			−0.7242	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	13.88	2.09	24	13.54	1.96	24	−0.34	1.88
	Traditional	31	12.39	2.44	31	12.87	1.65	31	.48	2.46
	t-Test Value		2.4293			1.3496			−1.3958	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	14.17	1.89	47	13.68	2.14	47	−0.49	1.97
	Traditional	61	12.70	2.26	61	12.84	1.74	61	.14	2.45
	t-Test Value		3.6639			2.2030			−1.4592	
	Probability		<.05			<.05			ns	

TABLE 4-26
Social Work Values Test—Innovation-Change vs. Traditionalism

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	12.33	1.50	12	12.67	1.67	12	.33	2.10
	Traditional	14	12.43	1.34	14	12.71	1.27	14	.29	1.77
	t-Test Value		−0.1642			−0.0793			0.0602	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	12.36	1.96	11	11.73	2.20	11	−0.63	1.91
	Traditional	16	12.19	1.11	16	11.81	1.42	16	−0.38	1.78
	t-Test Value		0.2854			−0.1177			−0.3495	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	12.75	1.57	24	11.58	1.21	24	−1.17	1.76
	Traditional	31	12.00	2.16	31	11.71	1.97	31	−0.29	2.12
	t-Test Value		1.4914			−0.2926			−1.6750	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	12.55	1.63	47	11.89	1.63	47	−0.66	1.95
	Traditional	61	12.15	1.75	61	11.97	1.72	61	−0.19	1.95
	t-Test Value		1.2434			−0.2268			−1.2684	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-27
Social Work Values Test—Total Score

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	12	129.42	11.99	12	134.67	11.10	12	5.25	10.10
	Traditional	14	126.64	10.46	14	131.86	9.53	14	5.21	10.03
	t-Test Value		0.6052			0.6674			0.0087	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	133.36	11.05	11	128.27	11.87	11	−5.09	10.23
	Traditional	16	129.50	11.83	16	125.81	11.09	16	−3.69	10.26
	t-Test Value		0.8243			0.5296			−0.3364	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	132.58	10.79	24	129.88	8.01	24	−2.70	7.85
	Traditional	31	127.10	10.91	31	127.19	9.84	31	−0.09	9.37
	t-Test Value		1.8615			1.1410			−1.2074	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	131.96	11.02	47	130.72	9.90	47	−1.24	9.68
	Traditional	61	127.62	10.93	61	127.90	10.19	61	0.28	10.09
	t-Test Value		2.0337			1.4499			−0.7905	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-28

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Knows Local Agencies, Their Functions and Services As These Pertain to the Needs of the Agency's Clientele (Item 1)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	11	4.18	1.33	12	7.17	1.11	11	3.01	1.67
	Traditional	14	4.86	2.03	14	7.43	1.34	14	2.57	2.59
	t-Test Value		−0.9146			−0.5148			0.4564	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	4.00	2.10	11	7.00	1.18	11	3.00	2.32
	Traditional	16	5.06	1.95	15	6.67	1.40	15	1.41	2.53
	t-Test Value		−1.2984			0.6154			1.5840	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	3.29	1.55	24	6.88	1.15	24	3.59	1.79
	Traditional	31	4.84	2.21	30	6.97	1.30	30	2.13	2.69
	t-Test Value		−3.0531			−0.2742			2.1502	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	46	3.67	1.66	47	6.98	1.13	46	3.30	1.88
	Traditional	61	4.90	2.07	59	7.00	1.34	59	2.12	2.62
	t-Test Value		−3.4014			−0.0886			2.6953	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-29
Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Uses Local Resources in Accordance with Treatment Objectives (Item 2)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	10	4.70	1.06	12	7.17	.94	10	2.40	.97
	Traditional	13	5.31	2.43	14	7.57	1.40	13	2.31	2.95
	t-Test Value		−0.7062			−0.8184			0.0907	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	10	4.00	2.49	11	7.00	1.18	10	3.00	2.47
	Traditional	16	4.88	2.00	15	6.73	1.53	15	1.60	1.99
	t-Test Value		−0.9475			0.4623			1.3908	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	22	3.64	1.47	24	7.12	1.36	22	3.45	1.77
	Traditional	30	5.00	2.21	30	7.33	1.45	29	2.45	2.77
	t-Test Value		−2.6701			−0.5435			1.5780	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	42	3.98	1.70	47	7.11	1.20	42	3.07	1.83
	Traditional	59	5.03	2.17	59	7.24	1.47	57	2.19	2.61
	t-Test Value		−2.7388			−0.5051			1.9673	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-30

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Recognizes and Is Concerned about the Practices and Policies of Local Agencies That Require Change, and Considers Steps for Making Those Changes (Item 3)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	10	4.70	1.34	12	6.83	1.75	10	1.90	2.28
	Traditional	13	4.85	1.51	14	5.79	2.12	13	.92	2.50
	t-Test Value		−0.2301			1.3074			0.9219	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	10	3.80	1.75	11	6.09	1.81	10	2.40	2.32
	Traditional	14	4.36	2.28	15	6.27	1.98	13	1.85	3.16
	t-Test Value		−0.6217			−0.2225			0.4455	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	3.12	1.90	24	6.75	1.48	24	3.63	2.34
	Traditional	29	4.00	1.96	30	6.10	1.67	28	2.04	2.44
	t-Test Value		−1.6457			1.5143			2.3946	
	Probability		ns			ns			<.05	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	44	3.64	1.83	47	6.62	1.62	44	2.98	2.39
	Traditional	56	4.29	1.95	59	6.07	1.84	54	1.72	2.63
	t-Test Value		−1.7100			1.6323			2.4254	
	Probability		ns			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-31
Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—
Can Describe the Role of the Professional Social Worker and the Method of Service to Professional and Lay Persons in the Agency and Community (Item 4)

Cycle	*Students*	*Start of Social Work Education*			*Completion of Social Work Education*			*t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning*		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	4.50	1.73	12	7.17	1.47	12	2.67	1.83
	Traditional	14	4.62	1.61	14	7.07	1.14	14	2.46	1.98
	t-Test Value		−0.1656			0.1787			0.2574	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	10	4.30	1.83	11	7.27	1.42	10	3.20	1.81
	Traditional	16	4.69	1.62	15	6.87	1.64	15	2.00	1.73
	t-Test Value		−0.5419			0.6332			1.5973	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	3.67	1.49	24	7.58	1.06	24	3.92	2.06
	Traditional	31	4.42	1.86	30	7.20	1.56	30	2.87	2.74
	t-Test Value		−1.6651			1.0707			1.6065	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	46	4.02	1.64	47	7.40	1.25	46	3.43	1.96
	Traditional	61	4.53	1.72	59	7.08	1.48	59	2.55	2.35
	t-Test Value		−1.5577			1.2078			2.0771	
	Probability		ns			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-32

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Knows About the Agency's Function and Relationships to Other Agencies and Programs (Item 5)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	12	5.08	1.38	12	7.00	.95	12	1.92	1.24
	Traditional	14	4.93	1.64	14	7.29	1.38	14	2.36	2.24
	t-Test Value		0.2479			−0.5796			−0.5825	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	4.55	1.81	11	7.27	1.68	11	2.72	1.85
	Traditional	16	5.25	1.57	15	7.40	1.35	15	1.87	1.60
	t-Test Value		−1.0353			−0.2055			1.2192	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	4.00	1.38	24	7.25	.85	24	3.25	1.59
	Traditional	31	5.00	1.97	30	7.13	1.48	30	2.23	2.62
	t-Test Value		−2.2116			0.3638			1.7562	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	4.40	1.53	47	7.19	1.10	47	2.79	1.64
	Traditional	61	5.05	1.77	59	7.24	1.41	59	2.19	2.28
	t-Test Value		−2.0269			−0.1884			1.6187	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-33

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Knows About the Agency Goals and Policies To Achieve These Goals (Item 6)

Cycle	*Students*	*Start of Social Work Education*			*Completion of Social Work Education*			*t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning*		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	5.17	1.40	12	7.00	1.04	12	1.83	1.11
	Traditional	14	5.07	1.90	14	7.36	1.15	14	2.29	2.40
	t-Test Value		0.1377			−0.7908			−0.5764	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	4.27	1.42	11	6.82	1.60	11	2.55	1.29
	Traditional	16	5.31	2.15	15	6.93	1.62	15	1.33	2.23
	t-Test Value		−1.3528			−0.1726			1.5538	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	4.12	1.62	24	7.21	1.10	24	3.09	2.26
	Traditional	31	4.97	1.56	30	7.00	1.49	30	2.07	2.27
	t-Test Value		−1.9422			0.5911			1.6370	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	4.43	1.56	47	7.06	1.21	47	2.63	1.87
	Traditional	61	5.08	1.78	59	7.07	1.44	59	1.93	2.28
	t-Test Value		−2.0390			−0.0155			1.7512	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-34

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Knows About and Uses Appropriately Channels of Communication, Rules, and Procedures of the Agency (Item 7)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	12	5.25	1.36	12	6.67	1.37	12	1.42	1.38
	Traditional	13	5.62	2.10	14	6.71	1.54	13	1.15	2.61
	t-Test Value		−0.4907			−0.0794			0.2984	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	4.09	2.07	11	6.45	1.75	11	2.36	2.80
	Traditional	16	5.31	2.36	15	6.60	1.55	15	1.00	2.30
	t-Test Value		−1.3362			−0.2149			1.3074	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	3.88	1.73	24	7.08	1.21	24	3.20	2.00
	Traditional	31	5.42	1.77	30	7.23	1.76	30	1.90	2.60
	t-Test Value		−3.2564			−0.3704			2.0878	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	4.28	1.79	47	6.83	1.39	47	2.55	2.18
	Traditional	60	5.43	1.98	59	6.95	1.65	58	1.50	2.52
	t-Test Value		−3.1676			−0.4037			2.2966	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-35

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Recognizes and Is Concerned About Agency Practices and Policies Requiring Change, and Considers Steps for Making Those Changes (Item 8)

Cycle	Students	*Start of Social Work Education*			*Completion of Social Work Education*			*t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning*		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	7	4.86	1.57	12	6.75	1.21	7	1.86	1.95
	Traditional	12	5.67	1.78	14	6.29	1.98	12	.50	2.58
	t-Test Value		−0.9450			0.6790			1.1411	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	3.64	2.01	11	6.27	1.42	11	2.63	2.29
	Traditional	15	4.20	2.01	15	6.20	1.97	14	2.00	2.69
	t-Test Value		−0.6787			0.1000			0.6006	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	3.50	1.74	24	7.04	1.20	24	3.54	2.13
	Traditional	31	4.32	2.20	30	5.87	1.92	30	1.55	2.77
	t-Test Value		−1.5477			2.7450			2.9111	
	Probability		ns			<.05			<.05	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	42	3.76	1.82	47	6.79	1.27	42	3.03	2.19
	Traditional	58	4.75	2.11	59	6.05	1.92	56	1.46	2.72
	t-Test Value		−2.0456			2.3650			3.1431	
	Probability		<.05			<.05			<.05	

TABLE 4-36
Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—
Complies with Agency Requirements for Recording and Communication (Item 9)

Cycle	Students	*Start of Social Work Education*			*Completion of Social Work Education*			*t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning*		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	6.50	1.83	12	6.33	2.02	12	−0.17	2.72
	Traditional	14	6.64	2.06	14	7.71	1.27	14	1.07	2.27
	t-Test Value		−0.1781			−2.0382			−1.2145	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	5.64	2.50	11	6.73	2.69	11	1.09	3.21
	Traditional	16	6.31	2.06	15	6.87	2.13	15	.47	1.68
	t-Test Value		−0.7389			−0.1416			0.6173	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	5.21	2.65	24	7.29	1.33	24	2.08	2.73
	Traditional	31	6.84	1.73	30	7.60	1.71	30	.80	2.50
	t-Test Value		−2.6094			−0.7432			1.7812	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	5.64	2.44	47	6.91	1.90	47	1.27	2.94
	Traditional	61	6.66	1.88	59	7.44	1.74	59	.78	2.24
	t-Test Value		−2.3656			−1.4684			0.9588	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-37

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—
Participates Sufficiently and Appropriately in Agency Staff Meetings (Item 10)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	11	5.55	1.37	12	7.17	1.11	11	1.82	1.94
	Traditional	14	6.15	1.95	14	7.21	1.37	13	1.23	1.88
	t-Test Value		−0.8320			−0.0925			0.7201	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	9	4.44	2.56	11	6.64	2.54	9	2.33	3.20
	Traditional	12	6.25	1.48	15	6.73	1.94	12	.42	2.68
	t-Test Value		−1.9336			−0.1059			1.4187	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	22	5.36	2.54	23	7.43	1.34	21	2.10	2.79
	Traditional	30	5.67	2.06	29	6.97	2.11	28	1.32	3.46
	t-Test Value		−0.4603			0.9737			0.8656	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	42	5.21	2.28	46	7.17	1.65	41	2.07	2.63
	Traditional	56	5.91	1.91	58	6.97	1.89	53	1.09	2.95
	t-Test Value		−1.5944			0.5993			1.6963	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-38
Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—
Cooperates with and Makes Use of Staff Members (Item 11)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	5.92	1.68	12	7.17	.94	12	1.25	1.86
	Traditional	14	6.21	1.93	14	7.50	1.40	14	1.28	2.16
	t-Test Value		−0.4001			−0.6733			−0.0429	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	4.91	2.21	11	7.45	1.69	11	2.54	2.21
	Traditional	16	6.38	2.00	15	7.80	.94	15	1.13	1.64
	t-Test Value		−1.7261			−0.6364			1.7972	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	5.46	2.15	24	7.58	1.10	24	2.12	2.40
	Traditional	31	5.94	1.95	30	7.20	1.75	30	1.30	2.51
	t-Test Value		−0.8510			0.9816			1.2301	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	5.45	2.04	47	7.45	1.21	47	2.00	2.24
	Traditional	61	6.11	1.93	59	7.42	1.50	59	1.25	2.20
	t-Test Value		−1.7253			0.0876			1.7174	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-39
Practice Skill Assessment Instrument— Helps Define and Express Own Learning Goals (Item 12)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	12	3.92	1.68	12	7.08	1.38	12	3.67	1.80
	Traditional	14	5.21	1.72	14	7.50	1.22	14	2.29	1.98
	t-Test Value		−1.8655			−0.7839			1.1335	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	4.45	1.44	11	6.27	1.85	11	1.82	2.27
	Traditional	16	5.69	1.82	15	6.80	1.82	15	1.00	2.75
	t-Test Value		−1.8110			−0.6964			0.7736	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	5.29	1.68	24	7.08	1.28	24	1.79	2.32
	Traditional	31	5.29	1.94	30	7.07	1.66	30	1.83	2.61
	t-Test Value		0.0028			0.4160			−0.0602	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	4.74	1.70	47	6.89	1.46	47	2.15	2.23
	Traditional	61	5.38	1.84	59	7.10	1.60	59	1.72	2.52
	t-Test Value		−1.8506			−0.6967			0.9106	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-40
Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Identifies Specific Areas of Competence (Item 13)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	12	3.83	1.64	12	6.58	1.73	12	2.75	2.05
	Traditional	14	5.07	1.98	14	7.29	1.14	14	2.21	2.33
	t-Test Value		−1.6510			−1.1896			0.5938	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	4.18	2.23	11	5.91	2.30	11	1.73	3.35
	Traditional	16	5.06	1.48	15	6.87	1.41	15	1.73	1.98
	t-Test Value		−1.1868			−1.2604			−0.0055	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	4.12	2.01	24	7.12	1.42	24	3.00	2.60
	Traditional	31	4.97	2.11	30	6.53	1.70	30	1.63	2.59
	t-Test Value		−1.5117			1.3930			1.9199	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	4.06	1.94	47	6.70	1.70	47	2.64	2.67
	Traditional	61	5.02	1.90	59	6.80	1.52	59	1.80	2.36
	t-Test Value		−2.5530			−0.2908			1.6979	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-41

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—
Points Out Areas of Difficulty in His Own Work with Clients (Item 14)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	12	3.83	1.27	12	6.83	1.80	12	3.00	1.86
	Traditional	14	5.71	1.86	14	6.93	1.33	14	1.21	2.52
	t-Test Value		−2.8493			−0.1487			1.9493	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	3.64	1.21	11	6.45	2.07	11	2.82	2.36
	Traditional	16	6.19	2.01	15	6.80	1.61	15	.67	2.19
	t-Test Value		−3.6305			−0.4597			2.2994	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	5.00	1.91	24	7.00	1.38	24	2.00	2.28
	Traditional	31	5.52	1.82	30	7.13	1.46	30	1.70	2.37
	t-Test Value		−1.0133			−0.3439			0.4720	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	4.38	1.71	47	6.83	1.65	47	2.45	2.20
	Traditional	61	5.74	1.87	59	7.00	1.45	59	1.32	2.36
	t-Test Value		−3.9138			−0.5572			2.5291	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-42
Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—
Distinguishes Between Personal, Professional, and Student Roles (Item 15)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	3.83	1.40	12	6.58	1.31	12	2.75	1.36
	Traditional	14	5.21	2.19	14	7.14	1.66	14	1.93	2.76
	t-Test Value		−1.8048			−0.9064			0.9019	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	4.09	1.76	11	6.18	1.94	11	2.09	2.47
	Traditional	16	5.94	1.69	15	6.20	1.82	15	.20	2.54
	t-Test Value		−2.6388			−0.0235			1.8231	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	4.38	2.26	24	6.67	1.13	24	2.29	2.49
	Traditional	31	5.00	2.35	30	7.37	1.59	30	2.43	2.71
	t-Test Value		−0.9988			−1.8911			−0.1995	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	4.17	1.94	47	6.53	1.38	47	2.36	2.22
	Traditional	61	5.30	2.16	59	7.02	1.71	59	1.75	2.80
	t-Test Value		−2.8431			−1.6173			1.2643	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-43

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Recognizes His Own Feelings as They Arise in and Effect the Treatment Process (Item 16)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	12	4.08	1.68	12	7.17	1.64	12	3.08	1.51
	Traditional	14	4.79	2.19	14	7.21	.98	14	2.43	2.77
	t-Test Value		−0.8708			−0.0877			0.7037	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	3.91	1.51	11	6.09	1.64	11	2.18	2.18
	Traditional	16	6.12	2.00	15	7.13	1.60	15	1.07	2.02
	t-Test Value		−2.9996			−1.5614			1.2924	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	4.62	2.00	24	7.04	1.37	24	2.42	2.22
	Traditional	31	4.90	2.33	30	6.97	1.75	30	2.20	2.83
	t-Test Value		−0.4765			0.1767			0.3148	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	4.32	1.81	47	6.85	1.53	47	2.53	2.04
	Traditional	61	5.20	2.25	59	7.07	1.54	59	1.97	2.65
	t-Test Value		−2.2477			−0.7217			1.2427	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-44
Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—
Disciplines and Utilizes Himself in Interaction with Clients (Item 17)

Cycle	*Students*	*Start of Social Work Education*			*Completion of Social Work Education*			*t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning*		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	4.00	1.35	12	6.92	1.31	12	2.92	1.56
	Traditional	14	5.00	2.22	14	7.00	.68	14	2.00	2.00
	t-Test Value		−1.3073			−0.1994			1.2355	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	4.00	1.67	11	6.45	2.02	11	2.45	2.16
	Traditional	16	4.81	1.80	15	6.93	1.71	15	1.93	2.25
	t-Test Value		−1.1422			−0.6275			0.5699	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	4.33	2.24	24	7.21	1.28	24	2.88	2.19
	Traditional	31	5.23	1.98	30	7.00	1.72	30	1.90	2.68
	t-Test Value		−1.5415			0.5089			1.4694	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	4.17	1.89	47	6.96	1.49	47	2.79	2.01
	Traditional	61	5.07	1.97	59	6.98	1.51	59	1.93	2.39
	t-Test Value		−2.3975			−0.0873			1.9992	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-45

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Applies Theories and Techniques of Intervention from Academic Courses to Practice (Item 18)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	3.50	1.45	12	7.00	1.04	12	3.50	1.31
	Traditional	14	4.14	1.61	14	7.00	.88	14	2.86	1.83
	t-Test Value		−1.0217			0.0000			0.9722	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	3.82	1.54	11	6.45	1.51	11	2.63	1.50
	Traditional	16	4.69	2.15	15	6.73	1.79	15	1.87	2.56
	t-Test Value		−1.1094			−0.4023			0.8562	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	4.42	1.86	24	7.38	1.17	24	2.96	2.33
	Traditional	29	4.93	2.05	30	6.70	1.82	28	1.86	2.94
	t-Test Value		−0.9555			1.6469			1.5053	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	4.04	1.71	47	7.06	1.26	47	3.02	1.93
	Traditional	59	4.68	1.98	59	6.78	1.62	57	2.10	2.60
	t-Test Value		−1.7744			1.0166			2.0589	
	Probability		ns			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-46

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Plans for, Participates in, and Utilizes Learning from Field Instructor Conferences (Item 19)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	12	5.25	1.71	12	7.25	1.42	12	2.00	1.28
	Traditional	13	5.92	1.61	14	7.43	1.22	13	1.62	2.22
	t-Test Value		−0.9730			−0.3308			0.5038	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	5.00	1.67	11	6.18	2.04	11	1.18	2.27
	Traditional	16	6.69	1.82	15	7.13	1.30	15	.47	2.26
	t-Test Value		−2.3570			−1.3914			0.7634	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	5.42	2.04	24	7.38	1.41	24	1.96	2.96
	Traditional	31	6.10	1.62	30	7.56	1.66	30	1.47	2.27
	t-Test Value		−1.3383			−0.2996			0.6717	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	5.28	1.85	47	7.06	1.62	47	1.78	2.45
	Traditional	60	6.22	1.67	59	7.39	1.46	58	1.24	2.27
	t-Test Value		−2.7230			−1.0741			1.1742	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-47

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Allocates Time Appropriately (Item 20)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	12	5.92	1.38	12	7.00	1.35	12	1.08	1.73
	Traditional	14	6.00	2.22	14	7.57	1.45	14	1.57	2.14
	t-Test Value		−0.1083			−0.9930			−0.6081	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	4.73	1.90	11	6.27	2.53	11	1.54	2.50
	Traditional	16	6.81	2.04	15	7.07	1.33	15	.26	1.83
	t-Test Value		−2.5806			−0.9933			1.4450	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	5.42	1.67	24	7.21	1.35	24	1.79	2.43
	Traditional	31	6.06	2.14	30	7.53	1.46	30	1.53	2.22
	t-Test Value		−1.2611			−0.8486			0.4029	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	5.38	1.68	47	6.94	1.70	47	1.56	2.26
	Traditional	61	6.25	2.13	59	7.42	1.42	59	1.22	2.15
	t-Test Value		−2.3587			−1.5782			0.7690	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-48

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—The Student Gives Evidence of Knowledge About Personality Characteristics As These Relate to Attitudes and Behavior (Item 21)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	3.92	1.31	12	7.33	1.07	12	3.42	1.44
	Traditional	14	4.71	2.02	14	7.00	.88	14	2.29	2.40
	t-Test Value		−1.1279			0.8371			1.3704	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	4.09	1.64	11	6.81	1.25	11	2.72	1.79
	Traditional	16	5.06	1.53	15	6.73	1.62	15	1.53	1.81
	t-Test Value		−1.5168			0.1390			1.6039	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	3.75	1.78	24	6.96	1.27	24	3.21	1.98
	Traditional	31	4.71	2.12	30	7.00	1.41	30	2.36	2.60
	t-Test Value		−1.8272			−0.1140			1.3488	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	3.87	1.61	47	7.02	1.21	47	3.15	1.79
	Traditional	61	4.80	1.93	59	6.93	1.35	59	2.13	2.37
	t-Test Value		−2.7303			0.3581			2.5070	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-49

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Shows Knowledge About the Client's Social Roles As These Are Related to Presenting Problems (Item 22)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	12	4.08	1.31	12	7.08	1.24	12	3.00	1.48
	Traditional	14	4.86	1.88	14	6.43	1.65	14	1.57	2.28
	t-Test Value		−1.1528			1.0837			1.7898	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	3.91	1.30	11	7.00	1.34	11	3.09	1.58
	Traditional	16	5.31	1.62	15	7.00	.93	15	1.53	1.68
	t-Test Value		−2.3001			0.0000			2.2980	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	
IV	Accelerated	24	4.38	1.71	24	7.12	1.19	24	2.74	2.31
	Traditional	31	4.77	2.31	30	7.00	1.31	29	2.34	2.53
	t-Test Value		−0.7138			0.3661			0.6096	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	4.19	1.51	47	7.09	1.21	47	2.90	1.94
	Traditional	61	4.93	2.03	59	6.86	1.32	58	1.93	2.27
	t-Test Value		−2.1638			0.8952			2.2999	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-50

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Evidences Knowledge About the Influence of Ethnic Groups, Social Class and Status, and Social Conditions on Behavior (Item 23)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	4.08	1.38	12	6.83	.72	12	2.75	1.42
	Traditional	14	5.21	1.72	14	6.50	1.70	14	1.29	1.64
	t-Test Value		−1.7587			0.6083			2.3193	
	Probability		ns			ns			<.05	
III	Accelerated	11	3.64	2.25	11	6.82	1.60	11	3.18	2.71
	Traditional	16	5.25	1.48	15	7.47	1.06	15	2.07	1.53
	t-Test Value		−2.1618			−1.1923			1.2762	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	4.58	1.84	24	7.12	1.12	24	2.54	2.45
	Traditional	31	5.13	2.11	30	7.10	1.69	30	2.10	2.75
	t-Test Value		−1.0230			0.0652			0.6238	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	4.23	1.84	47	6.98	1.15	47	2.75	2.27
	Traditional	61	5.18	1.85	59	7.05	1.57	59	1.90	2.25
	t-Test Value		−2.6412			−0.2727			1.9151	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-51

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Assesses the Information Necessary for an Adequate Diagnosis and Actively Seeks Information which Is Not Readily Available (Item 24)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	3.92	1.38	12	6.75	1.21	12	2.83	1.47
	Traditional	14	5.14	2.03	14	6.93	1.07	14	1.79	2.42
	t-Test Value		−1.7002			−0.3825			1.2551	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	3.27	1.74	11	6.45	1.81	11	3.18	1.89
	Traditional	16	4.88	1.93	15	6.73	1.53	15	1.73	2.22
	t-Test Value		−2.1248			−0.4075			1.6812	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	4.33	2.06	24	6.58	1.72	24	2.25	2.54
	Traditional	29	4.62	2.08	30	7.10	1.69	28	2.54	3.01
	t-Test Value		−0.5040			−1.1067			−0.3710	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	3.98	1.85	47	6.60	1.60	47	2.62	2.16
	Traditional	59	4.81	2.00	59	6.97	1.51	57	2.14	2.67
	t-Test Value		−2.2258			−1.2156			1.0061	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-52
Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Assesses Individual Presenting Problems of Clients Specifically and Skillfully (Item 25)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	12	4.25	1.06	12	7.25	1.42	12	3.00	1.54
	Traditional	14	5.14	1.88	14	7.00	.96	14	1.86	2.18
	t-Test Value		−1.4054			0.5105			1.4615	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	3.36	1.91	11	6.36	1.57	11	3.00	1.95
	Traditional	16	4.69	1.70	15	6.73	1.67	15	1.87	1.73
	t-Test Value		−1.8168			−0.5504			1.5037	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	4.04	1.63	24	6.75	1.54	24	2.71	2.18
	Traditional	31	4.74	1.79	30	7.17	1.68	30	2.50	2.30
	t-Test Value		−1.5152			−0.9480			0.3407	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	3.94	1.58	47	6.79	1.52	47	2.85	1.94
	Traditional	61	4.82	1.77	59	7.02	1.53	59	2.19	2.13
	t-Test Value		−2.7370			−0.7725			1.6757	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-53

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Accurately Assesses the Client's Capacity and Desire for Movement and Change (Item 26)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	12	4.08	1.00	12	6.75	1.60	12	2.67	1.61
	Traditional	13	4.38	2.14	14	6.64	.93	13	2.23	2.39
	t-Test Value		−0.4266			0.2037			0.5090	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	3.45	1.97	11	6.18	1.17	11	2.73	2.05
	Traditional	16	4.44	1.79	15	5.93	1.87	15	1.27	1.91
	t-Test Value		−1.2961			0.3735			1.7939	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	23	4.30	1.66	24	6.62	1.53	23	2.30	2.38
	Traditional	29	4.69	1.71	30	6.37	1.55	28	2.32	2.13
	t-Test Value		−0.8186			−0.5744			−0.0267	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	46	4.04	1.60	47	6.55	1.46	46	2.50	2.10
	Traditional	58	4.55	1.81	59	6.58	1.54	56	2.02	2.14
	t-Test Value		−1.5162			−0.0789			1.1442	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-54

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Establishes, Maintains and Manages an Effective Treatment Relationship (Item 27)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	5.17	1.34	12	7.33	1.07	12	2.17	1.40
	Traditional	14	5.43	2.10	14	7.29	1.07	14	1.86	2.57
	t-Test Value		−0.3573			0.1086			0.3580	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	4.36	2.29	11	7.27	1.27	11	2.91	2.51
	Traditional	16	5.19	1.64	15	7.27	1.44	15	1.87	1.81
	t-Test Value		−1.0468			0.0107			1.1833	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	23	4.43	1.97	24	7.75	1.19	23	3.26	2.47
	Traditional	31	5.58	1.73	30	7.57	1.38	30	2.03	2.28
	t-Test Value		−2.2236			0.5238			1.8523	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	46	4.61	1.90	47	7.53	1.18	46	2.89	2.25
	Traditional	61	5.44	1.78	59	7.42	1.32	59	1.94	2.21
	t-Test Value		−2.3096			0.4461			2.1445	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-55

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Formulates Explicit Diagnostic Statements with an Awareness of Problems Present on the Individual, Interpersonal, and Community Level (Item 28)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	4.00	1.28	12	6.75	1.48	12	2.75	.97
	Traditional	13	4.69	1.89	14	6.50	1.16	13	1.69	2.29
	t-Test Value		−1.0211			0.4626			1.4240	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	3.63	1.75	11	6.27	1.56	11	2.64	1.80
	Traditional	16	4.31	1.78	15	6.60	1.88	15	2.07	2.15
	t-Test Value		−0.9406			−0.4523			0.6849	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	3.50	1.69	24	6.50	1.32	24	3.00	2.28
	Traditional	29	4.55	1.96	30	6.53	1.61	28	2.04	2.82
	t-Test Value		−2.0970			−0.0835			1.3613	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	47	3.66	1.59	47	6.51	1.40	47	2.85	1.89
	Traditional	58	4.52	1.87	59	6.54	1.57	56	1.96	2.50
	t-Test Value		−2.5408			−0.1100			2.0479	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-56
Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Presents Evidence to Substantiate His Diagnosis (Item 29)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	12	3.92	1.31	12	6.83	1.53	12	2.92	.90
	Traditional	14	4.79	2.04	14	6.86	.95	14	2.07	2.40
	t-Test Value		−1.2163			−0.0465			1.1069	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	10	3.50	1.84	11	6.09	1.64	10	2.80	2.25
	Traditional	16	4.19	1.87	15	6.53	2.07	15	2.13	2.07
	t-Test Value		−0.8816			−0.5644			0.7314	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	24	3.58	1.74	24	6.71	1.46	24	3.13	2.51
	Traditional	29	4.48	1.99	30	6.63	1.63	28	2.25	2.52
	t-Test Value		−1.7521			0.1782			1.2519	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	46	3.65	1.64	47	6.60	1.51	46	3.00	2.11
	Traditional	59	4.47	1.95	59	6.66	1.60	57	2.18	2.34
	t-Test Value		−2.3480			−0.2148			1.8791	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-57

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—
The Student Formulates Achievable Treatment Goals in Which the Desired Outcomes Are Explicitly Stated and Relevant to His Functioning in His Social Environment. He Differentiates Between Intermediate and Terminal Goals (Item 30)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	4.08	1.24	12	6.42	1.38	12	2.33	1.56
	Traditional	14	4.50	2.03	14	6.71	1.07	14	2.21	2.15
	t-Test Value		−0.5949			−0.5949			0.1528	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	2.91	1.58	11	6.27	1.19	11	3.36	1.69
	Traditional	16	4.31	2.15	15	5.93	1.87	15	1.40	2.26
	t-Test Value		−1.7786			0.5078			2.3307	
	Probability		ns			ns			<.05	
IV	Accelerated	22	3.82	1.82	24	6.92	1.38	22	3.04	2.40
	Traditional	28	4.57	1.83	30	6.70	1.49	27	2.15	2.71
	t-Test Value		−1.4493			0.5533			1.2274	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	45	3.67	1.65	47	6.64	1.34	45	2.93	2.04
	Traditional	58	4.48	1.94	59	6.51	1.52	56	1.96	2.45
	t-Test Value		−2.3038			0.4657			2.1699	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-58

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Establishes a Contract with the Client That Is Within the Client's Current Level of Understanding Concerning the Change Goals and Anticipated Treatment (Item 31)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	11	3.73	1.10	12	6.75	1.42	11	3.18	1.33
	Traditional	14	4.64	1.86	14	7.00	.96	14	2.36	1.95
	t-Test Value		−1.3830			−0.5105			1.1536	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	3.45	1.63	11	6.55	1.37	11	3.09	1.70
	Traditional	16	5.00	2.07	15	6.40	1.80	15	1.13	2.26
	t-Test Value		−1.9963			0.2154			2.3177	
	Probability		ns			ns			<.05	
IV	Accelerated	23	4.13	1.66	24	7.17	1.24	23	3.00	2.37
	Traditional	31	4.87	1.80	30	6.90	1.42	30	2.13	2.43
	t-Test Value		−1.5626			0.7354			1.3034	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	45	3.87	1.53	47	6.91	1.32	45	3.07	1.97
	Traditional	61	4.85	1.86	59	6.80	1.44	59	1.93	2.30
	t-Test Value		−2.9878			0.4415			2.7072	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-59

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Guides Clients To Achieve Behavioral Changes That Are Beneficial to Their Own Interests and to Their Interactions with Other Individuals and Groups (Item 32)

Cycle	Students	*Start of Social Work Education*			*Completion of Social Work Education*			*t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning*		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	3.92	1.44	12	7.17	1.11	12	3.25	1.66
	Traditional	13	5.23	1.74	14	7.43	.76	13	2.15	1.95
	t-Test Value		−1.9628			−0.6814			1.4458	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	3.36	1.63	11	6.82	1.33	11	3.46	1.81
	Traditional	15	4.93	2.15	15	7.33	1.23	14	2.00	1.57
	t-Test Value		−1.9492			−0.9780			2.0626	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	21	3.90	1.67	21	7.42	1.21	21	3.38	2.13
	Traditional	30	4.57	1.91	30	7.17	1.56	29	2.62	2.74
	t-Test Value		−1.3134			0.6636			1.1017	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	44	3.77	1.58	44	7.21	1.21	44	3.36	1.89
	Traditional	58	4.81	1.92	59	7.27	1.31	56	2.36	2.31
	t-Test Value		−2.9862			0.2375			2.3952	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-60

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Works with Relevant Individuals, Groups and Organizations Other Than the Client To Facilitate Achievement of Treatment Goals (Item 33)

Cycle	*Students*	*Start of Social Work Education*			*Completion of Social Work Education*			*t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning*		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	10	5.30	1.34	12	7.42	1.31	10	1.90	1.45
	Traditional	13	6.00	1.35	14	6.86	1.35	13	1.00	2.12
	t-Test Value		−1.1807			1.0254			1.0997	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	9	4.33	1.66	11	6.36	2.16	9	2.77	1.64
	Traditional	16	5.31	1.85	15	7.67	.90	15	2.07	1.58
	t-Test Value		−1.2631			−2.0205			1.0073	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	22	4.68	2.01	24	7.25	1.29	22	2.45	2.58
	Traditional	30	5.40	1.90	30	7.40	1.25	29	2.07	2.27
	t-Test Value		−1.3017			−0.4300			0.5571	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	41	4.76	1.79	47	7.09	1.56	41	2.39	2.14
	Traditional	59	5.51	1.78	59	7.34	1.21	57	1.83	2.09
	t-Test Value		−2.0773			−0.9176			1.3027	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-61

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—
Evaluates Individual Change During and at the Termination of Treatment (Item 34)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	9	4.11	.93	12	6.75	1.42	9	2.67	1.41
	Traditional	10	4.80	1.32	14	6.86	1.23	10	2.40	1.51
	t-Test Value		−1.2343			−0.1978			0.3752	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	10	3.50	2.07	11	6.73	1.79	10	3.40	2.59
	Traditional	8	4.00	1.41	15	7.33	1.05	8	3.38	2.00
	t-Test Value		−0.5500			−1.0389			0.0212	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	19	4.16	1.92	24	7.04	1.37	19	2.63	2.43
	Traditional	22	4.41	2.28	30	7.07	1.66	22	2.50	2.96
	t-Test Value		−0.3826			−0.0607			0.1563	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	38	3.97	1.76	47	6.89	1.46	38	2.84	2.25
	Traditional	40	4.43	1.91	59	7.08	1.42	40	2.65	2.47
	t-Test Value		−1.0862			−0.6774			0.3598	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-62

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Prepares Client for Termination (Item 35)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	—	—	—	12	7.25	1.36	—	—	—
	Traditional	—	—	—	14	7.36	1.15	—	—	—
	t-Test Value		—			−0.2093			—	
	Probability		—			ns			—	
III	Accelerated	—	—	—	11	7.27	1.19	—	—	—
	Traditional	—	—	—	14	7.86	.66	—	—	—
	t-Test Value		—			−1.4914			—	
	Probability		—			ns			—	
IV	Accelerated	15	3.80	1.93	24	7.25	1.07	15	3.40	2.03
	Traditional	16	4.75	2.35	30	7.53	1.43	16	2.69	2.91
	t-Test Value		−1.2312			−0.8306			0.7940	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	24	3.54	2.00	47	7.26	1.15	24	3.79	2.08
	Traditional	26	4.77	2.07	58	7.57	1.22	26	2.73	2.52
	t-Test Value		−2.1349			−1.3540			1.6257	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-63
Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—
Terminates Services to the Client When Maximum Benefits Have Been Attained (Item 36)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	5	5.00	1.22	12	6.92	1.08	5	2.00	2.00
	Traditional	6	5.33	1.86	14	7.43	1.28	6	2.17	1.83
	t-Test Value		−0.3104			−1.0456			−0.1302	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	6	2.33	1.97	11	6.91	1.58	6	5.00	2.19
	Traditional	6	5.00	2.28	12	7.67	.89	6	2.83	1.94
	t-Test Value		−1.9803			−1.3700			1.6553	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	12	3.92	2.23	24	6.92	1.38	12	2.83	2.08
	Traditional	14	4.79	2.36	30	7.43	1.43	14	2.50	3.06
	t-Test Value		−0.9218			−1.3446			0.3070	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	23	3.74	2.14	47	6.91	1.33	23	3.22	2.30
	Traditional	26	4.96	2.16	56	7.48	1.28	26	2.50	2.52
	t-Test Value		−1.9871			−2.1917			1.0432	
	Probability		ns			<.05			ns	

TABLE 4-64
Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Discerns and Responds Appropriately to both Verbal and Nonverbal Communications During Treatment Sessions (Item 37)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	3.83	1.47	12	7.00	1.04	12	3.17	1.47
	Traditional	14	5.00	2.45	14	6.64	1.08	14	1.64	2.65
	t-Test Value		−1.3864			0.8192			1.7038	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	3.73	2.10	11	6.82	1.47	11	3.09	2.34
	Traditional	15	5.47	1.84	15	6.80	1.70	15	1.33	2.47
	t-Test Value		−2.1494			0.0274			1.7603	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	23	4.31	1.99	24	7.25	1.33	23	2.83	2.59
	Traditional	31	5.06	1.88	30	6.90	2.01	30	1.90	2.83
	t-Test Value		−1.2572			0.7683			1.2391	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	46	4.09	1.88	47	7.09	1.28	46	2.97	2.25
	Traditional	60	5.15	1.99	59	6.81	1.73	59	1.69	2.67
	t-Test Value		−2.8099			0.9285			2.6748	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-65

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Plans for Client Contacts in Order to Facilitate Movement Toward Treatment Goals (Item 38)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	12	4.58	1.16	12	7.08	1.16	12	2.50	1.31
	Traditional	14	5.00	2.35	14	7.07	1.20	14	2.07	2.50
	t-Test Value		−0.5357			0.0245			0.5138	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	11	4.00	1.55	11	6.45	1.63	11	2.45	1.75
	Traditional	15	5.33	1.88	15	6.93	1.67	15	1.60	2.50
	t-Test Value		−1.8483			−0.7007			0.9334	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	23	4.61	2.21	24	7.08	1.50	23	2.39	2.66
	Traditional	31	5.03	1.85	30	7.10	1.35	30	2.17	2.20
	t-Test Value		−0.7451			−0.0424			0.3282	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	46	4.46	1.82	47	6.94	1.45	46	2.43	2.14
	Traditional	60	5.10	1.95	59	7.05	1.38	59	2.00	2.32
	t-Test Value		−1.7458			−0.4128			0.9965	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-66

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Evidences Knowledge of Various Theories of Interpersonal Change That Are Germane to Casework (Item 39)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	9	3.77	1.30	11	7.27	1.10	8	3.88	1.13
	Traditional	12	4.25	1.82	12	6.67	.89	10	2.40	2.07
	t-Test Value		−0.6306			1.3918			1.7116	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	9	3.44	1.88	9	6.78	1.30	8	3.50	2.39
	Traditional	10	4.20	1.87	15	6.73	1.58	9	1.89	2.26
	t-Test Value		−0.8292			0.0681			1.3409	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	22	3.36	1.92	21	6.86	1.24	20	3.40	1.96
	Traditional	29	4.66	1.99	28	6.46	1.99	26	1.54	2.55
	t-Test Value		−2.3463			0.8487			2.8015	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	40	3.48	1.75	41	6.95	1.20	36	3.52	1.87
	Traditional	51	4.47	1.90	55	6.58	1.67	45	1.80	2.37
	t-Test Value		−2.5899			1.2576			3.6633	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-67

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Identifies and Differentiates the Structural and Interactional Patterns That Exist Within Relevant Groups to Which the Client Belongs (Item 40)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	9	3.78	1.30	11	6.09	1.22	8	2.75	1.67
	Traditional	11	4.55	1.69	12	6.08	1.44	9	1.78	2.22
	t-Test Value		−1.0587			0.0129			0.9482	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	9	3.22	1.99	9	6.78	1.20	8	3.50	2.33
	Traditional	10	4.10	1.10	15	6.67	1.50	9	2.22	2.11
	t-Test Value		−1.1416			0.1811			1.1150	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	22	3.55	2.09	21	6.76	1.22	20	3.10	2.17
	Traditional	30	4.23	1.85	28	6.57	1.75	27	2.22	2.52
	t-Test Value		−1.2312			0.4482			1.2792	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	40	3.53	1.88	41	6.59	1.22	36	3.11	2.07
	Traditional	51	4.27	1.67	55	6.49	1.61	45	2.13	2.34
	t-Test Value		−1.9792			0.3267			1.9938	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-68
Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Perceives Patterns in Client's Behavior, and Attempts To Determine Their Underlying Cause and Meaning (Item 41)

Cycle	*Students*	*Start of Social Work Education*			*Completion of Social Work Education*			*t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning*		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	9	4.78	1.56	11	6.82	1.25	8	2.25	1.83
	Traditional	11	5.18	2.04	12	6.92	1.16	9	2.11	2.37
	t-Test Value		−0.4632			−0.1869			0.1259	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	9	3.56	1.33	9	6.56	1.24	8	3.00	2.00
	Traditional	10	4.10	2.08	15	7.13	1.19	9	2.33	2.40
	t-Test Value		−0.6349			−1.0881			0.5806	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	22	3.50	2.22	21	6.81	1.36	20	3.20	2.73
	Traditional	30	5.17	1.86	28	6.86	1.88	27	1.63	2.59
	t-Test Value		−2.8618			−0.1027			1.9946	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	40	3.80	1.95	41	6.76	1.28	36	2.94	2.38
	Traditional	51	4.96	1.95	55	6.95	1.56	45	1.87	2.47
	t-Test Value		−2.8186			−0.6532			1.9911	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-69
Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—
Establishes a Viable Treatment Plan Related to Individual Treatment Goals (Item 42)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	9	4.11	1.05	11	6.81	1.17	8	3.00	1.20
	Traditional	10	4.20	1.81	12	6.92	1.24	8	2.87	1.55
	t-Test Value		−0.1218			−0.1869			0.1688	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	9	3.56	2.07	9	6.33	1.73	8	2.87	2.70
	Traditional	10	3.70	1.42	15	6.67	1.54	9	2.78	1.09
	t-Test Value		−0.1693			−0.4682			0.0934	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	21	3.33	2.08	21	6.95	1.32	19	3.62	2.89
	Traditional	29	4.59	1.09	28	6.79	1.71	26	2.20	2.80
	t-Test Value		−2.1784			0.3851			1.8330	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	39	3.56	1.88	41	6.78	1.37	35	3.29	2.52
	Traditional	49	4.33	1.80	55	6.78	1.55	43	2.33	2.34
	t-Test Value		−1.9307			−0.0045			1.7305	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-70
Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Demonstrates Skill in Interviewing (Item 43)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	9	4.22	1.64	11	7.27	1.27	8	3.25	1.49
	Traditional	12	4.67	2.02	12	7.25	.62	10	2.80	2.30
	t-Test Value		−0.5143			0.0527			0.4516	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	9	3.33	1.41	9	7.00	1.22	8	3.75	1.91
	Traditional	10	4.20	1.69	15	7.07	1.67	9	3.00	1.80
	t-Test Value		−1.1412			−0.0998			0.7823	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	21	4.29	2.12	21	7.33	1.24	19	3.11	2.64
	Traditional	30	5.20	1.67	28	6.93	1.70	27	1.63	2.45
	t-Test Value		−1.6479			0.9648			1.9204	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	39	4.05	1.88	41	7.24	1.22	35	3.29	2.23
	Traditional	52	4.88	1.77	55	7.04	1.50	46	2.15	2.35
	t-Test Value		−2.1487			0.7461			2.2149	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-71

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Uses Interviewing Skills Differentially in Accordance with the Context of Client Contact (Item 44)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	7	4.23	1.90	11	6.45	1.57	6	2.50	1.97
	Traditional	11	4.64	2.42	12	6.83	1.11	9	2.33	2.50
	t-Test Value		−0.1815			−0.6408			0.1278	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	9	3.11	1.69	9	7.22	.97	8	4.12	2.17
	Traditional	10	4.00	1.89	15	7.00	1.93	9	3.11	1.90
	t-Test Value		−1.0187			0.3085			0.9654	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	22	3.50	1.57	21	7.19	1.17	20	3.75	2.27
	Traditional	28	4.57	1.85	28	6.68	1.68	26	2.03	2.49
	t-Test Value		−2.2135			1.2582			2.4311	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	38	3.58	1.67	41	7.00	1.26	34	3.62	2.21
	Traditional	49	4.47	1.97	55	6.80	1.63	44	2.32	2.37
	t-Test Value		−2.2793			0.6777			2.4995	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-72

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Encourages the Client's Participation in the Analysis, Evaluation, and Solution of His Problems (Item 45)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	9	4.11	1.17	11	7.27	1.27	8	3.62	1.41
	Traditional	12	4.50	2.47	12	6.67	.98	10	2.60	2.50
	t-Test Value		−0.4161			1.2263			0.9754	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	8	3.88	1.73	9	6.78	1.20	7	3.00	2.45
	Traditional	10	4.10	1.73	15	7.06	1.49	9	2.44	1.94
	t-Test Value		−0.2588			−0.4731			0.4731	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	21	3.57	1.66	21	7.14	1.31	19	3.57	2.43
	Traditional	29	4.52	1.68	28	7.00	1.49	26	2.31	2.46
	t-Test Value		−1.9770			0.3553			1.7221	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	38	3.76	1.55	41	7.10	1.26	34	3.47	2.19
	Traditional	51	4.43	1.87	55	6.95	1.38	45	2.40	2.33
	t-Test Value		−1.8417			0.5614			2.0922	
	Probability		ns			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-73
Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Has Ability To Use Various Therapeutic Techniques on Appropriate Occasions (Item 46)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	9	3.56	2.13	11	6.63	1.29	8	3.50	2.14
	Traditional	10	4.70	2.21	12	6.75	1.06	8	2.38	2.26
	t-Test Value		−1.0840			−0.2221			0.9559	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	8	3.12	1.81	9	6.44	.73	7	3.42	1.81
	Traditional	10	3.40	1.65	15	6.87	1.60	9	3.22	2.11
	t-Test Value		−0.3178			−0.7160			0.1930	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	19	3.32	1.53	21	7.10	1.26	17	3.53	1.97
	Traditional	28	4.14	2.21	28	6.79	1.73	26	2.42	3.26
	t-Test Value		−1.5177			0.7245			1.3845	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	36	3.33	1.71	41	6.83	1.18	32	3.50	1.92
	Traditional	48	4.10	2.11	55	6.80	1.54	43	2.58	2.86
	t-Test Value		−1.8513			0.1052			1.6646	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-74
Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Assesses Adequately the Client's Readiness for New Behavioral Tasks or New Understanding and Structures the Treatment Process in Terms of This Assessment (Item 47)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	9	3.67	1.32	11	6.45	1.37	8	3.12	1.13
	Traditional	19	4.60	2.12	12	6.42	1.00	8	2.00	2.51
	t-Test Value		−1.0755			0.0729			1.0830	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	8	3.25	1.75	9	6.11	1.36	7	3.29	2.29
	Traditional	9	3.78	1.86	15	6.53	1.36	8	2.50	2.43
	t-Test Value		−0.5643			−0.7055			0.7868	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	20	3.30	1.63	21	6.95	1.47	18	3.61	2.62
	Traditional	29	4.14	1.90	28	6.50	1.60	26	2.23	2.67
	t-Test Value		−1.6527			1.0283			1.7058	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	37	3.38	1.55	41	6.63	1.43	33	3.42	2.22
	Traditional	47	4.17	1.92	55	6.49	1.40	42	2.10	2.54
	t-Test Value		−2.0946			0.4904			2.2404	
	Probability		<.05			ns			<.05	

TABLE 4-75

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Interprets the Behavior and Feelings of the Client and Others with Whom the Client Comes Into Contact in Ways That Are Meaningful to the Client (Item 48)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	9	4.44	1.42	11	6.73	1.27	8	2.50	1.20
	Traditional	11	4.09	2.12	12	6.83	.94	9	3.33	2.60
	t-Test Value		0.4057			−0.2187			−0.7818	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	9	3.67	2.18	9	6.67	1.58	8	3.00	2.39
	Traditional	10	4.00	1.33	15	6.86	1.60	9	2.89	1.97
	t-Test Value		−0.3845			−0.2854			0.0987	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	21	4.14	2.15	21	7.29	1.31	19	3.05	2.72
	Traditional	30	4.70	1.82	28	6.71	1.70	27	1.89	2.67
	t-Test Value		−0.9683			1.3306			1.4415	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	39	4.10	1.98	41	7.00	1.36	35	2.91	2.33
	Traditional	51	4.43	1.80	55	6.78	1.51	45	2.39	2.55
	t-Test Value		−0.8103			0.7411			0.9796	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-76

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Uses the Treatment Relationship in Order To Promote Rather Than Impede the Achievement of Treatment Goals (Item 49)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	9	4.22	1.79	11	6.91	1.30	8	2.62	1.77
	Traditional	12	4.08	2.15	12	7.42	.79	10	3.40	2.46
	t-Test Value		0.1495			−1.0898			−0.7070	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	9	4.22	1.79	9	7.00	1.12	8	2.87	1.96
	Traditional	10	4.20	2.04	15	7.27	1.87	9	3.11	2.37
	t-Test Value		0.0237			−0.3717			−0.2088	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	21	4.43	2.20	21	7.57	1.08	19	3.26	2.66
	Traditional	29	5.10	1.61	28	7.36	1.91	26	2.19	2.43
	t-Test Value		−1.1915			0.4978			1.3812	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	39	4.33	1.98	41	7.27	1.16	35	3.03	2.29
	Traditional	51	4.69	1.86	55	7.35	1.69	45	2.64	2.43
	t-Test Value		−0.8607			−0.2647			0.7235	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-77

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Adequately Recognizes the Points of Strain or Harmony in the Ongoing Worker-Client Relationship, and Relates These to His Own Feelings and Those of the Client (Item 50)

Cycle	*Students*	*Start of Social Work Education*			*Completion of Social Work Education*			*t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning*		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	9	3.89	1.83	11	6.45	1.57	8	3.12	2.17
	Traditional	11	4.45	2.70	12	6.92	1.00	9	2.44	3.32
	t-Test Value		−0.5085			−0.8112			0.4637	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	9	3.67	1.94	9	6.67	1.50	8	3.00	2.20
	Traditional	10	4.70	1.83	15	6.73	1.91	9	2.11	2.57
	t-Test Value		−1.1312			−0.0857			0.7144	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	21	3.86	2.08	21	7.10	1.37	19	3.37	2.50
	Traditional	29	4.69	2.12	28	7.25	1.99	26	2.54	3.10
	t-Test Value		−1.3845			−0.3214			0.9929	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	39	3.82	1.94	41	6.83	1.45	35	3.23	2.30
	Traditional	50	4.64	2.16	55	7.04	1.78	44	2.43	2.98
	t-Test Value		−1.8767			−0.6273			1.3396	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-78

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—
Provides Support for Desirable Behaviors and Expressions of Feeling (Item 51)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	9	4.33	1.50	11	7.18	.87	8	3.00	1.77
	Traditional	11	5.45	2.11	12	7.33	.78	9	2.11	2.37
	t-Test Value		−1.2700			−0.4202			0.8146	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	9	4.00	2.35	9	7.33	1.00	8	3.12	2.75
	Traditional	10	5.40	1.71	15	7.06	1.16	9	1.44	1.67
	t-Test Value		−1.4150			0.5482			1.4492	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	22	4.68	2.12	21	7.48	1.12	20	2.85	2.62
	Traditional	28	5.07	1.84	28	7.50	1.62	25	2.36	2.64
	t-Test Value		−0.6817			−0.0607			0.6207	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	40	4.45	2.02	41	7.37	1.02	36	2.94	2.43
	Traditional	49	5.22	1.85	55	7.35	1.35	43	2.12	2.39
	t-Test Value		−1.8650			0.0844			1.5208	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-79

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—
Refrains from Encouraging Behaviors That Are Judged Undesirable (Item 52)

Cycle	*Students*	*Start of Social Work Education*			*Completion of Social Work Education*			*t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning*		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	9	4.67	1.80	11	7.00	1.10	8	2.50	1.69
	Traditional	11	5.27	2.20	12	6.92	.90	9	2.11	2.71
	t-Test Value		−0.6308			0.1911			0.3284	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	9	3.67	2.06	9	7.33	1.12	8	3.75	2.60
	Traditional	10	5.40	1.84	15	8.00	1.00	9	2.11	1.54
	t-Test Value		−1.8327			−1.4475			1.5030	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	21	4.67	2.24	21	7.47	1.12	19	2.89	2.58
	Traditional	28	5.39	2.23	28	7.36	1.66	25	1.88	2.49
	t-Test Value		−1.1234			0.2990			1.3122	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	39	4.44	2.10	41	7.32	1.11	35	3.00	2.39
	Traditional	49	5.37	2.11	55	7.44	1.40	43	1.98	2.32
	t-Test Value		−2.0632			−0.4667			1.9044	
	Probability		<.05			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-80

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Actively Discourages Behavior Which Has Immediate and Present Danger for Either the Client or Others (Item 53)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	9	4.11	2.03	11	7.00	1.55	8	3.00	2.07
	Traditional	11	4.82	2.44	12	7.00	1.48	9	2.22	2.77
	t-Test Value		−0.6589			0.0000			0.6093	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	9	4.11	2.37	9	7.00	.71	8	2.75	2.12
	Traditional	9	5.33	1.87	15	8.07	.88	8	2.12	1.96
	t-Test Value		−1.1453			−2.9468			0.5726	
	Probability		ns			<.05			ns	
IV	Accelerated	20	5.25	2.22	21	7.67	1.11	18	2.39	2.64
	Traditional	24	5.54	1.93	28	7.32	1.52	23	1.65	2.10
	t-Test Value		−0.4598			0.9198			0.9685	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	38	4.71	2.23	41	7.34	1.20	34	2.62	2.35
	Traditional	44	5.32	2.03	55	7.45	1.40	40	1.88	2.20
	t-Test Value		−1.2823			−0.4260			1.3960	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-81

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Anticipates Difficulties in the Client's Environmental Situations and Prepares the Client for Them (Item 54)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	9	4.00	1.66	11	6.82	.87	8	2.75	1.49
	Traditional	10	4.80	2.20	12	6.75	1.96	8	1.88	3.27
	t-Test Value		−0.8391			0.1014			0.6443	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	9	3.78	1.99	9	6.55	1.51	8	2.75	2.38
	Traditional	10	4.80	1.75	15	6.73	1.47	9	1.67	2.18
	t-Test Value		−1.1277			−0.2700			0.9210	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	21	4.24	1.70	21	7.29	1.23	19	3.05	2.46
	Traditional	27	4.59	2.17	28	6.93	1.46	25	2.12	2.76
	t-Test Value		−0.6345			0.9263			1.1816	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	39	4.08	1.72	41	7.00	1.22	35	2.91	2.20
	Traditional	47	4.68	2.05	55	6.84	1.56	42	1.98	2.69
	t-Test Value		−1.4826			0.5754			1.6824	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-82

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Modifies Interactional and Structural Patterns in Relevant Groups to Which the Client Belongs

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	—	—	—	11	6.73	1.10	—	—	—
	Traditional	—	—	—	12	6.50	1.57	—	—	—
	t-Test Value		—			0.3811			—	
	Probability		—			ns			—	
III	Accelerated	8	3.50	2.45	9	5.89	1.83	7	2.43	2.23
	Traditional	9	4.11	1.27	14	6.93	1.14	8	2.62	1.30
	t-Test Value		−0.6161			−1.6016			−0.1970	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	17	3.76	1.68	21	6.62	1.07	15	2.73	2.31
	Traditional	25	4.60	2.04	26	6.73	1.31	21	2.05	2.48
	t-Test Value		−1.4490			−0.3212			0.8508	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	29	3.83	1.81	41	6.49	1.29	26	2.58	2.08
	Traditional	45	4.51	1.87	52	6.73	1.32	38	2.11	2.22
	t-Test Value		−1.5645			−0.8952			0.8672	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-83

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Uses Existing Interactional and Structural Patterns To Facilitate the Achievement of Treatment Goals (Item 56)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
II	Accelerated	—	—	—	9	6.73	1.42	—	—	—
	Traditional	—	—	—	15	6.67	.98	—	—	—
	t-Test Value		—			0.1144			—	
	Probability		—			ns			—	
III	Accelerated	8	3.50	2.56	9	6.44	1.67	7	2.71	2.87
	Traditional	10	4.60	1.84	15	6.80	1.37	9	1.78	1.99
	t-Test Value		−0.9932			−0.5418			0.7204	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	20	3.80	1.79	21	7.24	1.34	18	3.78	2.59
	Traditional	29	4.62	1.88	28	6.93	1.36	26	2.63	2.39
	t-Test Value		−1.5434			0.7960			1.3114	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	32	3.88	1.91	39	6.93	1.44	29	3.00	2.45
	Traditional	50	4.70	1.82	48	6.84	1.27	44	2.07	2.20
	t-Test Value		−1.9405			0.3200			1.6544	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

TABLE 4-84

Practice Skill Assessment Instrument—Effects Appropriate Changes in the Individual's Relationships to His External Environment (Item 57)

Cycle	Students	Start of Social Work Education			Completion of Social Work Education			t-Test Value Based on Difference in Learning		
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
II	Accelerated	8	4.12	1.35	11	7.00	1.00	7	3.14	1.07
	Traditional	11	4.82	1.66	12	6.67	.98	9	2.00	1.87
	t-Test Value		−0.9158			0.7691			1.3501	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
III	Accelerated	8	3.50	2.45	9	6.67	.71	7	3.14	2.73
	Traditional	10	4.60	1.17	13	7.23	1.01	7	2.00	1.00
	t-Test Value		−1.1802			−1.3776			0.9615	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
IV	Accelerated	17	4.59	1.80	21	7.19	1.33	15	2.47	2.42
	Traditional	27	4.63	2.02	28	7.11	1.20	25	2.24	2.55
	t-Test Value		−0.0707			0.2268			0.2811	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	
II-IV Combined	Accelerated	33	4.21	1.88	41	7.02	1.13	29	2.79	2.21
	Traditional	48	4.67	1.77	53	7.04	1.11	41	2.15	2.19
	t-Test Value		−1.0944			−0.0573			1.2116	
	Probability		ns			ns			ns	

Bibliography

Bibliography

Bloom, Martin. "Evaluation of Social Work Education Outcomes: A Survey of Pre-Behavioral, Behavioral, and Post-Behavioral Solutions." Paper delivered at the School of Social Work, University of Wisconsin–Madison, June 1973.

Bloom, Samuel. "In Evaluation of Undergraduate Psychiatric Teaching." In *Conference Proceedings.* Washington, D.C.: Association of Southern Professors of Psychiatry, 1958.

Bisno, Herbert. *The Place of the Undergraduate Curriculum in Social Work Education,* Curriculum Study, Vol. 11. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1959.

Campbell, Donald T. "Reforms As Experiments." *American Psychologist* 24 (1969): 409–29.

Carter, Reginald K. "Clients' Resistance to Negative Findings and the Latent Conservative Function of Evaluation Studies." *The American Sociologist* 6 (1971): 118–24.

Eysenck, Hans. *The Effects of Psychotherapy.* New York: International Science Press, 1966.

Fisher, Joel. "Is Casework Effective? A Review." *Social Work* 8 (1973): 5–20.

Fox, David J. "Issues in Evaluating Programs for Disadvantaged Children." *The Urban Review* 2 (1967): 6–8.

Goldstein, Harris K. *Maximizing Research Learning for Three Types of Social Work Students.* Tallahassee, Fla.: Florida State University, 1972.

Guide to the Use of the GRE Scores in Graduate Admissions 1971–72. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1971.

Hollis, Florence. "The Implications of the Curriculum Study for Social Work." *Journal of Jewish Communal Service* 37 (1960): 135–42.

Horrocks, J. E.; Horrocks, W. B.; and Trayer, M. E. *A Study of Barry Black.* Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1960.

Hyman, Herbert H.; Wright, Charles R.; and Hopkins, Terence. *Application of Methods of Evaluation: Four Studies of the Encampment for Citizenship.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962.

Kadushin, Alfred. "A Proposal for an Accelerated Program in Social

Work Education and Design for Evaluation." Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin School of Social Work, n.d.

________. "Testing the Discriminatory Capabilities of a Series of Evaluation Measures As Applied to a Program of Social Work Education," mimeographed. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin School of Social Work, 1968.

Kadushin, Alfred, and Kelling, George. "Final Report: An Innovative Program in Social Work Education, the 3-2 Program," mimeographed. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin School of Social Work, 1973.

Mayer, John E., and Rosenblatt, Aaron. "Encounters with Danger: Social Workers in the Ghetto." *Sociology of Work and Occupations* 2 (August 1975): 227–45.

Meyer, Henry J., and McLeod, Donna L. "A Study of the Values of Social Workers." In *Behavioral Science for Social Workers*, ed. Edwin Thomas. New York: Free Press, 1967.

Mullen, Edward J., and Chazin, Robert. "An Experimental Inter-university 4-1 Continuum: An Interim Report." Paper presented at the 20th Annual Program Meeting of the Council on Social Work Education, Atlanta, Georgia, March 1974.

Navarre, Elizabeth, and Sarri, Rosemary C. "Report on the Preliminary Analysis of Criteria for Assessing Student Progress in Group Work Field Instruction," mimeographed. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan School of Social Work, 1967.

Rosenblatt, Aaron. "A Comparison of Faculty Ratings of Student Essays," mimeographed. Garden City, N.Y.: Adelphi University School of Social Work, 1968.

________. "Practitioner's Use and Evaluation of Research." *Social Work* 13 (1968): 53–59.

________. "Social Constraints Affecting the Interpretation of Findings in Evaluative Studies." An earlier version of this paper was delivered at a conference on evaluative research at the University of Wisconsin–Madison School of Social Work, June 11–13, 1973.

Rosenblatt, Aaron, and Mayer, John E. "Objectionable Supervisory Styles: The Students' View." *Social Work* 20 (1975): 184–89.

Sarri, Rosemary C., and Vinter, Robert. *Practice Skill Assessment Instrument.* Ann Arbor, Mich.: Campus Publishers, 1967.

Schlesinger, Elfriede, and Wolock, Isabel. "An Accelerated and Traditional MSW Program Compared." *Journal of Education for Social Work* 10 (Winter 1974): 68–76.

Self-Study for Accreditation Review. Vol. 1. Garden City, N.Y.: Adelphi University School of Social Work, 1965.

Smalley, Ruth. "Reaction to the Curriculum Study." *Social Work* 4 (1959): 105–107.

Towle, Charlotte. "Objectives for the Social Work Curriculum for the

Future." *Social Service Review* 33 (1959): 362-87.

Traux, Charles, and Corkhuff, R. R. *Toward Effective Counseling and Psychotherapy.* Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

Trela, James, and O'Toole, Richard. *Roles for Sociologists in Service Organizations.* Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1974.

Tripodi, Tony. *Uses and Abuses of Social Research in Social Work.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1974.

Varley, Barbara K. "Social Work Values: Changes in Value Commitments of Students from Admission to MSW Graduation." *Journal of Education for Social Work* 4 (1968): 67–76.

Walz, Thomas. "The Minnesota Inventory of Social Work Knowledge," mimeographed. Minneapolis: School of Social Work, University of Minnesota, 1972.

Ward, David A., and Kassebaum, Gene G. "On Biting the Hand That Feeds." In *Evaluating Action Programs,* ed. Carol Weiss. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

Weinberger, Paul. "The Undergraduate Continuum Project: A Final Report," mimeographed. San Diego: School of Social Work, San Diego State University, 1972.

Weiss, Carol H. "The Politicization of Evaluation Research." *Journal of Social Issues* 26 (1970): 57–68.

Wojciechowski, Sophie. "The Continuum in Social Work Education." Paper presented at the 19th Annual Program Meeting of the Council on Social Work Education, San Francisco, February 1973.